The Judeo-LGBTQ Movement

“Repairing the World” via Destroying Society

By THR, December 2025

Table of Contents

Introduction.....5
Original LGBTQ Organizations (Weimar Germany).....6
Scientific-Humanitarian Committee.....6
Founder.....6
Chairmen.....7
Deputy.....9
Austrian Branch.....10
Founder.....10
World League for Sexual Reform.....11
Founder.....11
Presidents.....12
Institute for Sexual Science.....13
Total Average.....22
Pre-Stonewall American LGBTQ Organizations.....23
Mattachine Society.....23
Founder.....23
One Institute.....24
Founder.....24
Financier.....25
Homophile Action League.....25
Founders.....25
Mattachine Midwest.....27
Founders.....27
Janus Society.....29
Presidents.....29
Personal Rights in Defense and Education.....31
Founder.....31
Eastern Regional Conference of Homophile Organizations.....32
Founders.....32
North American Conference of Homophile Organizations.....33
Founders.....33
Total Average.....34
Pro-LGBTQ Intellectuals.....36
Psychiatry writers on Pro-LGBTQ topics.....36

Medical writers on Pro-LGBTQ topics....40
Pro-LGBTQ Notable Sexologists....42
Total Average....60
The Removal of Homosexuality from The DSM....61
American Psychological Association Officers 1973....64
Decriminalization of Homosexuality....66
Soviet Union....67
Legalization of Same-Sex Marriage....69
America....69
Miscellaneous Case Law....69
Baehr vs Miike....70
Judges....70
United States v. Windsor....71
Plaintiff....71
Law Bill....71
Respect for Marriage Act (America)....71
Sponsors....72
Canada....74
Miscellaneous Case Law....74
M. v H....74
Trial Judge....75
Law Bill....75
Civil Marriage Act....75
Introducer....76
Miscellaneous Modern LGBTQ Organizations....76
Drag Queen Story Time....77
Founder....77
Advocates for Trans Equality....77
Founder....78
Executive Director....78
Former Director of External Relations and Policy Advisor....79
Massachusetts Transgender Political Coalition....80
Former Executive Director....81
Trans Student Educational Resources....82
Founder....82
Sylvia Rivera Law Project....82

Founder....83
Truth Wins Out....83
Founder....84
Indivisible....84
Founders....85
Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays....86
Founders....86
interACT....88
Founder....88
Think Again....89
Founders....89
Transgender Europe....90
Executive Director....90
GenderPAC....91
Founder....91
Founding Executive Director....92
Gender Rights Maryland....93
Executive Director....93
Freedom to Marry....94
Founder....94
LGBTory....95
Founder....95
Miscellaneous Pro-LGBTQ Media....96
Television Channels....96
Logo TV....96
First President....96
Former Executive Vice-President and General Manager....97
Here TV....98
Founders....98
Pornography Companies....99
Lucas Entertainment....99
Founder....99
Nova Studios....100
Founder....100
Shane's World....101
Founder....101

Miscellaneous Notable Pro-LGBTQ Individuals.....102
Judaic Scriptures.....104
Hermaphrodite.....106
Androgynous.....143
Tumtum.....160
Aylonit.....192
Saris.....217
Tikkun Olam.....237
Miscellaneous Quotes.....245
Conclusion.....249

Introduction

The purpose of this book is to show the big amount of Jewish involvement in the advancement of the LGBTQ Movement from it’s inception to it’s modern phenomena, tying it to certain underlying scriptures in Judaism that are alleged to be the background guide of the agenda.

For the Tikkun Olam section, I want to acknowledge that a considerable amount of information in it was pulled from Christopher Jon Bjerknes’s book Beware the World to Come. He did much more research than I have in that topic, so read his book, I will probably make a future edition where I include more things in the Tikkun Olam section due to currently not being the most informed in this part of the LGBTQ agenda, so it will be expanded upon later and it is not a complete takedown of it in it’s current state.

Original LGBTQ Organizations (Weimar Germany)

Scientific-Humanitarian Committee

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scientific-Humanitarian_Committee#:~:text=founded%20by%20Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20in%20Berlin%20in%20May%201897)

(https://archive.ph/uiTeO#selection-1817.2-1825.12:~:text=was%20founded%20by%20Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20in%20Berlin%20in%20May%201897)

Founder

Magnus Hirschfeld (Jewish)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1063.0-1063.111:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/magnus-hirschfeld-and-the-institute-for-sexual-science/#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/lbWys#selection-199.0-199.83:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

Chairmen

(https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wissenschaftlich-humanit%C3%A4res_Komitee#:~:text=He%20was%20succeeded%20by%20the%20medical%20officer%20Otto%20Juliusburger%20%2C%20and%20Kurt%20Hiller%20was%20elected%20second%20chairman)

(https://archive.ph/wFHvi#selection-2803.46-2817.46:~:text=He%20was%20succeeded%20by%20the%20medical%20officer%20Otto%20Juliusburger%20%2C%20and%20Kurt%20Hiller%20was%20elected%20second%20chairman)

Magnus Hirschfeld (Jewish)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1063.0-1063.111:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/magnus-hirschfeld-and-the-institute-for-sexual-science/#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/lbWys#selection-199.0-199.83:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

Otto Juliusburger (Jewish, son of Ernestine Friedlaender)

(https://www.wikitree.com/wiki/Friedlaender-25#:~:text=She%20is%20buried%20in%20the%20Breslau%20Lohestrasse%20Jewish%20Cemetary)

(https://archive.ph/WTMXE#selection-1495.80-1495.136:~:text=She%20is%20buried%20in%20the%20Breslau%20Lohestrasse%20Jewish%20Cemetary)

(https://www.wikitree.com/wiki/Juliusburger-9#:~:text=son%20of%20Bernhard%20Juliusburger%20and%20Ernestine%20Friedlaender)

(https://archive.ph/LqvP1#selection-1675.34-1681.22:~:text=son%20of%20Bernhard%20Juliusburger%20and%20Ernestine%20Friedlaender)

(https://www.online-ofb.de/famreport.php?ofb=juden_nw&ID=I158028&lang=en)

(https://archive.ph/8Mvua)

(https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Otto_Juliusburger#:~:text=Otto%20Juliusburger%2C%20the%20son%20of%20a%20respected%20Jewish%20merchant)

(https://archive.ph/k3fuk#selection-1909.0-1923.9:~:text=Otto%20Juliusburger%2C%20the%20son%20of%20a%20respected%20Jewish%20merchant)

Kurt Hiller (Jewish)

(https://portal.ehri-project.eu/units/gb-003348-wl3000_9_1-606#:~:text=Dr.%20Kurt%20Hiller%20(1885%2D1972)%20was%20a%20Jewish%2DGerman%20lawyer)

(https://archive.ph/3ARmg)

(https://www.jta.org/archive/kurt-hiller-victim-of-nazi-gestapo-in-serious-condition-paper-reveals#:~:text=Kurt%20Hiller%2C%20well%2Dknown%20Jewish%20journalist)

(https://archive.ph/cF5n9#selection-745.0-745.41:~:text=Kurt%20Hiller%2C%20well%2Dknown%20Jewish%20journalist)

(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229513503_Kurt_Hiller_-_A_'Stankerer'_in_Exile_1934-1955#:~:text=As%20a%20homosexual%2C%20Jew%2C%20political%20agitator%2C%20pacifist%20and%20anti%2Dfascist%2C%20Hiller)

(https://archive.ph/Ad5L7#selection-531.391-531.466:~:text=As%20a%20homosexual%2C%20Jew%2C%20political%20agitator%2C%20pacifist%20and%20anti%2Dfascist%2C%20Hiller)

Deputy

Georg Merzbach (Jewish)

(https://magnus-hirschfeld.de/gedenken/personen/merzbach-g/#:~:text=Georg%20(Gustav%20Viktor)%20Merzbach%20was%20born%20in%20Magdeburg%20in%201868%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/sKYqd#selection-291.0-291.81:~:text=Georg%20(Gustav%20Viktor)%20Merzbach%20was%20born%20in%20Magdeburg%20in%201868%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Georg_Merzbach#:~:text=Merzbach%2C%20who%20came%20from%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/wioRb#selection-1863.0-1863.39:~:text=Merzbach%2C%20who%20came%20from%20a%20Jewish%20family)

Austrian Branch

(https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wissenschaftlich-humanit%C3%A4res_Komitee#:~:text=The%20branch%20was%20founded%20in%201906%20by%20the%20psychoanalyst%20Wilhelm%20Stekel)

(https://archive.ph/wFHvi#selection-3251.0-3259.14:~:text=The%20branch%20was%20founded%20in%201906%20by%20the%20psychoanalyst%20Wilhelm%20Stekel)

Founder

Wilhelm Stekel (Jewish)

(https://biographycentral.com/biography/wilhelm_stekel#:~:text=His%20father%2C%20a%20Jewish%20merchant)

(https://archive.ph/iQRAy#selection-247.146-247.175:~:text=His%20father%2C%20a%20Jewish%20merchant)

(https://www.discovermagazine.com/five-sex-research-pioneers-youve-probably-never-heard-of-26592#:~:text=Stekel%2C%20the%20son%20of%20an%20illiterate%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20father)

(https://archive.ph/7lOZP#selection-419.12-419.67:~:text=Stekel%2C%20the%20son%20of%20an%20illiterate%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20father)

(https://spotlight.anumuseum.org.il/austria/person/stekel-wilhelm-1868-1940/)

(https://archive.ph/NOdnU)

6 Jews out of 6 total

100% Jewish

World League for Sexual Reform

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/World_League_for_Sexual_Reform#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%2C%20the%20British%20physician%20Havelock%20Ellis%20and%20Swiss%20psychiatrist%20Auguste%20Forel%20were%20elected%20the%20first%20presidents%20of%20the%20World%20League.%20From%201930%2C%20Norman%20Haire%20and%20Dane%20Jonathan%20Leunbach%20replaced%20the%20elderly%20and%20largely%20inactive%20Ellis%20and%20Forel)

(https://archive.ph/GpEKg#selection-1907.0-1915.164:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%2C%20the%20British%20physician%20Havelock%20Ellis%20and%20Swiss%20psychiatrist%20Auguste%20Forel%20were%20elected%20the%20first%20presidents%20of%20the%20World%20League.%20From%201930%2C%20Norman%20Haire%20and%20Dane%20Jonathan%20Leunbach%20replaced%20the%20elderly%20and%20largely%20inactive%20Ellis%20and%20Forel)

Founder

Magnus Hirschfeld (Jewish)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1063.0-1063.111:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/magnus-hirschfeld-and-the-institute-for-sexual-science/#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/lbWys#selection-199.0-199.83:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

Presidents

Magnus Hirschfeld (Jewish)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1063.0-1063.111:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/magnus-hirschfeld-and-the-institute-for-sexual-science/#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/lbWys#selection-199.0-199.83:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

Havelock Ellis (Not Jewish)

Auguste Forel (Not Jewish)

Norman Haire – Norman Zions (Jewish)

(https://adb.anu.edu.au/biography/haire-norman-10390#:~:text=Religious%20Influence,Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/L9Aa#selection-577.0-585.6:~:text=Religious%20Influence,Jewish)

(https://embryo.asu.edu/pages/norman-haire-1892-1952#:~:text=His%20father%20was%20a%20Jewish%20immigrant)

(https://archive.ph/zq4YY#selection-669.150-669.183:~:text=His%20father%20was%20a%20Jewish%20immigrant)

(https://sydneyuniversitypress.com/products/9781743320068#:~:text=he%20was%20a%20poor%20Jewish%20outsider)

(https://archive.ph/1TFl3#selection-1063.201-1063.230:~:text=he%20was%20a%20poor%20Jewish%20outsider)

Jonathan Leunbach (Not Jewish)

3 Jews out of 6 total

50% Jewish

Institute for Sexual Science

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Institut_f%C3%BCr_Sexualwissenschaft#:~:text=%5B27%5D-,Organization,-%5Bedit%5D)

(https://archive.ph/YxcDp#selection-2261.0-2281.1:~:text=9%5D%5B26%5D-,Organization%E2%80%8B%5Bedit%5D,-The%20institute%20was)

(Not including Adelheid Rennhack due to being simply a housekeeper not a researcher)

Magnus Hirschfeld (Jewish)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1063.0-1063.111:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/magnus-hirschfeld-and-the-institute-for-sexual-science/#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/lbWys#selection-199.0-199.83:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/zvzTB#selection-303.0-303.84:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

Felix Abraham (Jewish)

(https://www.academia.edu/37497997/UROLOGY_under_the_SWASTIKA: UROLOGY under the SWASTIKA page 53)

(https://zagria.blogspot.com/2022/09/felix-abraham-1901-1937-doctor.html#:~:text=didn%27t%20work%20out.-,He%20was%20Jewish,-and%20almost%20the)

(https://archive.ph/Xiss7#selection-821.74-821.87:~:text=didn%27t%20work%20out.-,He%20was%20Jewish,-and%20almost%20the)

(https://www.neu-isenburg.de/microsite/memorial-book/names/abraham-felix#:~:text=Felix%20Abraham%20was%20born%20at%20the%20Jewish%20Hospital)

(https://archive.ph/blNqj#selection-345.19-345.64:~:text=Felix%20Abraham%20was%20born%20at%20the%20Jewish%20Hospital)

(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388110442_Jewish_Transgender_Pioneers_-_Hirschfeld_Kronfeld_Abraham_Hiller_Levy-Lenz_Weil_and_Schapiro: Jewish Transgender Pioneers - Hirschfeld, Kronfeld, Abraham, Hiller, Levy-Lenz, Weil, and Schapiro page 3, 10)

August Bessunger (Jewish)

(https://www.bundesarchiv.de/gedenkbuch/en1039945)

(https://archive.ph/VQkjI)

(https://collections.yadvashem.org/en/names/4089364#:~:text=Murdered-,Bessunger,List%20of%20murdered%20Jews%20from%20Germany,-Bessunger)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20251103104349/https://collections.yadvashem.org/en/names/13524134#:~:text=death%3A%20Auschwitz%2C%20Poland.-,Bessunger,List%20of%20murdered%20Jews%20from%20Germany,-Bessunger)

(https://archive.ph/c4G8m#selection-1403.0-1403.17:~:text=Neumann%20and%20Finger-,Bessunger%2C%20August,-%2C%20Dr.%20med)

(https://www.academia.edu/37497997/UROLOGY_under_the_SWASTIKA: UROLOGY under the SWASTIKA page 53)

Karl Giese (Jewish partner Magnus Hirschfeld)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=years%2Dlong%20romantic%20partnership%20with%20Karl%20Giese)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1399.14-1399.61:~:text=years%2Dlong%20romantic%20partnership%20with%20Karl%20Giese)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_Giese#:~:text=life%20partner%20of%20Magnus%20Hirschfeld)

(https://archive.ph/fJFkd#selection-1689.76-1691.17:~:text=the%20life%20partner%20of%20Magnus%20Hirschfeld)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Li_Shiu_Tong#:~:text=Li%20and%20Giese%20were%20named%20the%20primary%20heirs%20in%20Hirschfeld%27s%20will)

(https://archive.ph/hw6Hf#selection-2407.0-2407.62:~:text=Li%20and%20Giese%20were%20named%20the%20primary%20heirs%20in%20Hirschfeld%27s%20will)

Berndt Götz (Jewish)

(https://www.hirschfeld.in-berlin.de/institut/en/personen/pers_27.html)

(https://archive.ph/XIAXI#selection-59.10-59.229:~:text=G%C3%B6tz%20was%20dismissed%20by%20the%20Nazis%20since%20he%20was%20a%20Jew.%20He%20was%20imprisoned%20for%20a%20short%20time%20for%20communist%20activities%20and%20emigrated%20to%20Palestine%20in%201934.%20There%20he%20worked%20as%20a%20doctor%20and%20shoemaker%20on%20a%20kibbutz%20outside%20Tel%20Aviv)

(https://szufladamalgosi.pl/berndt-goetz-psychiatra-seksuolog-kibucnik-z-rybnika/#:~:text=A%20Jewish%20psychiatrist,wouldn%27t%20be%20rosy)

(https://archive.ph/SY0OG#selection-559.88-559.413:~:text=A%20Jewish%20psychiatrist,wouldn%27t%20be%20rosy)

(https://www.familysearch.org/en/surname?surname=goetz#:~:text=Jewish%20(Ashkenazic%3B%20also%20G%C3%B6tz)

(https://archive.ph/nfXBT)

Kurt Hiller (Jewish)

(https://portal.ehri-project.eu/units/gb-003348-wl3000_9_1-606#:~:text=Dr.%20Kurt%20Hiller%20(1885%2D1972)%20was%20a%20Jewish%2DGerman%20lawyer)

(https://archive.ph/3ARmg)

(https://www.jta.org/archive/kurt-hiller-victim-of-nazi-gestapo-in-serious-condition-paper-reveals#:~:text=Kurt%20Hiller%2C%20well%2Dknown%20Jewish%20journalist)

(https://archive.ph/cF5n9#selection-745.0-745.41:~:text=Kurt%20Hiller%2C%20well%2Dknown%20Jewish%20journalist)

(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/229513503_Kurt_Hiller_-_A_'Stankerer'_in_Exile_1934-1955#:~:text=As%20a%20homosexual%2C%20Jew%2C%20political%20agitator%2C%20pacifist%20and%20anti%2Dfascist%2C%20Hiller)

(https://archive.ph/Ad5L7#selection-531.391-531.466:~:text=As%20a%20homosexual%2C%20Jew%2C%20political%20agitator%2C%20pacifist%20and%20anti%2Dfascist%2C%20Hiller)

Max Hodann (Jewish)

(https://www.sciencedirect.com/org/science/article/pii/S2211624919000056#FN000074:~:text=German%2DJewish%20doctor%20and%20sexologist%20Max%20Hodann)

(https://www.aup-online.com/docserver/fulltext/22116249/8/1/22116257_008_01_s003_text.pdf?expires=1762117631&id=id&accname=guest&checksum=A0F9FA8A2673A95DEC2CF9C525C47F36)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Hodann#:~:text=Jewish%20eugenicists-,Jewish%20socialists,-German%20military%20doctors)

(https://archive.ph/Pb0XS#selection-4605.0-4605.17:~:text=Jewish%20eugenicists-,Jewish%20socialists,-German%20military%20doctors)

(https://archive.org/details/jewish-domination-of-weimar-germany/page/13/mode/2up: Jewish Domination of Weimar Germany page 13)

(https://dokumen.pub/germany-and-the-jewish-problem.html: Germany and the Jewish Problem page 43)

Hans Friedenthal (Jewish)

(https://www.academia.edu/37497997/UROLOGY_under_the_SWASTIKA: UROLOGY under the SWASTIKA page 53)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Dr-Hans-Friedenthal/6000000036919551839#:~:text=Hans%20Wilhelm%20Carl%20Friedenthal%20in%20Germany%2C%20Jewish%20Victims%20of%20Nazi%20Persecution%2C%2019)

(https://archive.ph/NLmdm#selection-1825.0-1827.52:~:text=Hans%20Wilhelm%20Carl%20Friedenthal%20in%20Germany%2C%20Jewish%20Victims%20of%20Nazi%20Persecution%2C%2019)

(https://archive.org/details/BrockhausAndEfronJewishEncyclopedia/Brockhaus_and_Efron_Jewish_Encyclopedia_15/page/n217/mode/2up: Jewish Encyclopedia of Brockhaus and Efron. Volume 15 page 438)

Arthur Kronfeld (Jewish)

(https://www.nli.org.il/en/a-topic/98700726409090517 1#:~:text=Arthur%20Kronfeld%20was%20a%20German%20psychiatrist%20of%20Jewish%20origin)

(https://archive.ph/cLOyL)

(https://www.sgipt.org/gesch/kronf/kronf_e.htm#:~:text=In%20memory%20of,psychiatrist%20and%20psychotherapist)

(https://archive.ph/3Qhc#selection-201.0-211.58:~:text=In%20memory%20of,psychiatrist%20and%20psychotherapist)

(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388110442_Jewish_Transgender_Pioneers_-_Hirschfeld_Kronfeld_Abraham_Hiller_Levy-Lenz_Weil_and_Schapiro: Jewish Transgender Pioneers - Hirschfeld, Kronfeld, Abraham, Hiller, Levy-Lenz, Weil, and Schapiro page 3, 7)

Ludwig Levy-Lenz (Jewish)

(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388110442_Jewish_Transgender_Pioneers_-_Hirschfeld_Kronfeld_Abraham_Hiller_Levy-Lenz_Weil_and_Schapiro: Jewish Transgender Pioneers - Hirschfeld, Kronfeld, Abraham, Hiller, Levy-Lenz, Weil, and Schapiro page 3, 17)

(https://www.cosmeticmedicine-online.com/originals/portrait-two-significant-jewish-doctors-erich-langer-ludwig-levy-lenz-2/#:~:text=two%20significant%20Jewish%20doctors%3A%20Erich%20Langer%20and%20Ludwig%20Levy%2DLenz)

(https://archive.ph/U9hHv#selection-317.29-317.94:~:text=two%20significant%20Jewish%20doctors%3A%20Erich%20Langer%20and%20Ludwig%20Levy%2DLenz)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Levy%2DLenz%2C%20who%20like%20Hirschfeld%20was%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/zvzTB#selection-683.0-683.41:~:text=Levy%2DLenz%2C%20who%20like%20Hirschfeld%20was%20Jewish)

(https://www.utterlyinteresting.com/post/the-weimar-republic-and-the-first-transgender-clinic#:~:text=Levy%2DLenz%2C%20who%20shared%20Hirschfeld%27s%20Jewish%20heritage)

(https://archive.ph/RQ3oH#selection-1177.0-1177.50:~:text=Levy%2DLenz%2C%20who%20shared%20Hirschfeld%27s%20Jewish%20heritage)

Eugen Littaur (Jewish spouse Toni Littaur, sister of Else Daniel, daughter of Clara Mann)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Eugen-Littaur/6000000017554125070)

(https://archive.ph/wLRQZ)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Toni-Littaur/6000000017553934288)

(https://archive.ph/AaOuk)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Clara-Mann/6000000017553183928)

(https://archive.ph/fWNSg)

(https://database.meranoebraica.it/de/2179)

(https://archive.ph/5wbLk)

(https://hohenemsgenealogie.at/getperson.php?personID=I34938&tree=Hohenems&sitever=standard#:~:text=database%20of%20the%20Jewish%20Museum%20Merano)

(https://archive.ph/pUrD7#selection-959.41-959.77:~:text=database%20of%20the%20Jewish%20Museum%20Merano)

(https://www.joodsmonument.nl/en/page/512412/about-else-daniel-mann#:~:text=About%3A-,Jewish%20war%20victim,-Else%20Daniel%2DMann)

(https://archive.ph/exSQ1#selection-345.31-358.0:~:text=About%3A-,Jewish%20war%20victim,-Else%20Daniel%2DMann)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Else-Daniel/6000000090105513982)

(https://archive.ph/Uy4m7)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Else-Daniel/6000000090105513982#:~:text=Else%20Daniel%20(born%20Mann)%20in%20Jewish,in%20Jewish%20Holocaust%20Memorials%20and%20Jewish%20Residents)

Franz Prange (Not Jewish)

Ferdinand von Reitzenstein (Not Jewish)

Friedrich Wertheim (Not Jewish)

Bernard Schapiro (Jewish)

(https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/12703271/)

(https://archive.ph/vD5xV)

(https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/15635756/)

(https://archive.ph/kB1ih)

(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388110442_Jewish_Transgender_Pioneers_-_Hirschfeld_Kronfeld_Abraham_Hiller_Levy-Lenz_Weil_and_Schapiro: Jewish Transgender Pioneers - Hirschfeld, Kronfeld, Abraham, Hiller, Levy-Lenz, Weil, and Schapiro page 3, 24)

(https://www.academia.edu/37497997/UROLOGY_under_the_SWASTIKA: UROLOGY under the SWASTIKA page 53)

Arthur Weil (Jewish, father of Ingeborg Weil)

(https://www.stolpersteine-heidelberg.de/mediapool/63/638182/data/2012/Stolpersteine_HD_2012-11-15_Brosch_re_V_2.0_2012-10-12.pdf: Stolpersteine Initiative Heidelberg: 3. Stolpersteinverlegung am Donnerstag, 15.11.2012, in Heidelberg page 19)

“da jüdische Kinder in dieser Zeit schonkeine regulären Schulklassen mehr besuchen konnten – Schülerin der jüdischen Schulklasse in der Pestalozzischule in der Heidelberger Weststadt”

“Since Jewish children at that time could no longer attend regular school classes – a student from the Jewish school class at the Pestalozzi School in Heidelberg's Weststadt district”

(https://www.geni.com/people/Arthur-Weil/6000000027426808331#:~:text=Father%20of%20Ingeborg%20S.%20Ohringer)

(https://archive.ph/oyGho#selection-1375.1-1377.20:~:text=Father%20of%20Ingeborg%20S.%20Ohringer)

(https://www.researchgate.net/publication/388110442_Jewish_Transgender_Pioneers_-_Hirschfeld_Kronfeld_Abraham_Hiller_Levy-Lenz_Weil_and_Schapiro: Jewish Transgender Pioneers - Hirschfeld, Kronfeld, Abraham, Hiller, Levy-Lenz, Weil, and Schapiro page 3, 20)

(https://www.catalogus-professorum-halensis.de/weilarthur.html#:~:text=Religious%20affiliation%3A,Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/cSj2y#selection-583.0-591.6:~:text=Religious%20affiliation%3A,Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Weil_(surname)#:~:text=German%2DJewish%20surnames)

(https://archive.ph/Y9Aqm#selection-71.0-75.8:~:text=German%2DJewish%20surnames)

Hans Kreiselmaier (Not Jewish)

Ewald Lausch (Not Jewish)

Arthur Röser (Not Jewish)

Hans Graaz (Not Jewish)

Friedrich Hauptstein (Not Jewish)

13 Jews out of 21 total

61.9% Jewish

Total Average

Scientific-Humanitarian Committee:

6 Jews

0 Non-Jews

6 Total

100% Jewish

World League for Sexual Reform:

3 Jews

3 Non-Jews

6 Total

50% Jewish

Institute for Sexual Science:

13 Jews

8 Non-Jews

21 Total

61.9% Jewish

Total Average

21 Jews

11 Non-Jews

32 Total

65.62% Jewish

Pre-Stonewall American LGBTQ Organizations

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBTQ_rights_in_the_United_States#:~:text=Early%20LGBTQ%20rights,Veterans%20Benevolent%20Association)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20250905020355/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBTQ_rights_in_the_United_States#:~:text=Early%20LGBT%20rights,Veterans%20Benevolent%20Association)

Mattachine Society

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mattachine_Society#:~:text=Communist%20and%20labor%20activist%20Harry%20Hay%20formed%20the%20group)

(https://archive.ph/8JIw3#selection-1861.1-1865.17:~:text=Communist%20and%20labor%20activist%20Harry%20Hay%20formed%20the%20group)

Founder

Harry Hay (Jewish spouse Anita Platky)

(https://www.theguardian.com/news/2002/nov/02/guardianobituaries.gayrights#:~:text=Anita%20Platky%2C%20a%20tall%2C%20boyish%20looking%20Jewish%20woman)

(https://archive.ph/WBmK7#selection-1243.258-1243.307:~:text=Anita%20Platky%2C%20a%20tall%2C%20boyish%20looking%20Jewish%20woman)

(https://www.workers.org/2005/us/lgbtseries-0512/#:~:text=do%20Catholic%20family%2C-,Platky%20was%20Jewish,-.)

(https://archive.ph/kgQvb#selection-495.192-495.209:~:text=do%20Catholic%20family%2C-,Platky%20was%20Jewish,-.)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Hay#Later_life:~:text=in%201938%20he%20married%20Anna%20Platky%20(1914%2D1983)%2C%20a%20Marxist%20Party%20member%20from%20a%20working%2Dclass%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/293TD#selection-3793.24-3793.125:~:text=in%201938%20he%20married%20Anna%20Platky%20(1914%2D1983)%2C%20a%20Marxist%20Party%20member%20from%20a%20working%2Dclass%20Jewish%20family)

One Institute

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/One_Institute#:~:text=The%20idea%20for%20an%20organization%20dedicated%20to%20homosexuals%20emerged%20from%20a%20Mattachine%20Society%20discussion%20meeting)

(https://archive.ph/zG9DM#selection-2211.139-2215.19:~:text=The%20idea%20for%20an%20organization%20dedicated%20to%20homosexuals%20emerged%20from%20a%20Mattachine%20Society%20discussion%20meeting)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/LGBTQ_movements#LGBTQ_rights_movement_(1974%E2%80%93present):~:text=ONE%2C%20Inc.%2C%20the%20first%20public%20homosexual%20organization%20in%20the%20U.S.%2C%5B74%5D%20was%20bankrolled%20by%20the%20wealthy%20transsexual%20man%20Reed%20Erickson)

(https://archive.ph/A3Q2K#selection-6793.0-6809.13:~:text=ONE%2C%20Inc.%2C%20the%20first%20public%20homosexual%20organization%20in%20the%20U.S.%2C%5B74%5D%20was%20bankrolled%20by%20the%20wealthy%20transsexual%20man%20Reed%20Erickson)

Founder

Mattachine Society

Financier

Reed Erickson (Jewish)

(https://archive.org/details/encyclopediaofle0001unse_c3g4/mode/2up?: Encyclopedia of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History in America page 353)

(https://onlineacademiccommunity.uvic.ca/ahdevor/wp-content/uploads/sites/2247/2016/12/ReedErickson.pdf)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reed_Erickson#:~:text=German%2DJewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/FQb9K#selection-1693.28-1693.48:~:text=German%2DJewish%20family)

Homophile Action League

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homophile_Action_League#:~:text=Co%2Dfounder,Carole%20Friedman)

(https://archive.ph/G3Ono#selection-1465.0-1483.15:~:text=Co%2Dfounder,Carole%20Friedman)

Founders

Ada Bello (Jewish partner Carole Friedman)

(https://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/philadelphia-lgbt-interviews/int/ada-bello#:~:text=And%20then%20I%20had%20a%20relationship%20with%20Carole%20Friedman.%20Carole%20and%20I%20were%20lovers)

(https://archive.ph/JkMu0#selection-1187.88-1187.155:~:text=I%20had%20a%20relationship%20with%20Carole%20Friedman.%20Carole%20and%20I%20were%20lovers)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Homophile_Action_League#:~:text=LGBT%20rights%20activists%20and%20lovers%20Ada%20Bello%20and%20Carole%20Friedman)

(https://archive.ph/G3Ono#selection-1617.58-1621.20:~:text=LGBT%20rights%20activists%20and%20lovers%20Ada%20Bello%20and%20Carole%20Friedman)

Carole Friedman (Jewish)

(https://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/philadelphia-lgbt-interviews/int/fried#:~:text=Race/Ethnicity%3A%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/ceWnF#selection-331.0-331.22:~:text=Race/Ethnicity%3A%20Jewish)

(https://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/philadelphia-lgbt-interviews/int#:~:text=Axler%2C%20Barron%2C%20Davidson%2C-,Friedman,-%2C%20Kabin%2C%20%E2%80%9CKendall%2C%E2%80%9D%20Oshtry)

(https://archive.ph/0sWbG#selection-325.26-325.34:~:text=Axler%2C%20Barron%2C%20Davidson%2C-,Friedman,-%2C%20Kabin%2C%20%E2%80%9CKendall%2C%E2%80%9D%20Oshtry)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedman#:~:text=from%20the%2017th%20century%20were%20also%20adopted%20by%20Ashkenazi%20Jews%20(see%20Jewish%20surnames).%20It%20is%20the%209th%20most%20common%20surname%20in%20Israel%20(8th%20among%20Jews)%20and%20most%20common%20exclusively%20Ashkenazi%20name)

(https://archive.ph/K8NtT#selection-1815.23-1819.110:~:text=from%20the%2017th%20century%20were%20also%20adopted%20by%20Ashkenazi%20Jews.%20It%20is%20the%209th%20most%20common%20surname%20in%20Israel%20(8th%20among%20Jews)%20and%20most%20common%20exclusively%20Ashkenazi%20name)

Mattachine Midwest

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mattachine_Midwest#Formation:~:text=Founder,Scott%0AValerie%20Taylor)

(https://archive.ph/bY29N#selection-1747.0-1769.14:~:text=Founder,Scott%0AValerie%20Taylor)

Founders

Bob Basker – Solomon Basker (Jewish)

(https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:%2F13030%2Fc86976rg#:~:text=Robert%20S.%20Basker%20was%20born%20Solomon%20Sloane%20Basker%20in%20Harlem%2C%20New%20York%2C%201918%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/KK8xe#selection-471.0-471.93:~:text=Robert%20S.%20Basker%20was%20born%20Solomon%20Sloane%20Basker%20in%20Harlem%2C%20New%20York%2C%201918%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(http://www.elisarolle.com/queerplaces/a-b-ce/Bob%20Basker.html#:~:text=Raised%20in%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20home)

(https://archive.ph/YCsKB#selection-35.0-35.33:~:text=Raised%20in%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20home)

(https://www.sfgate.com/news/article/bob-basker-pioneer-advocate-for-gay-rights-2919845.php#:~:text=An%20Orthodox%20Jew%2C%20Mr.%20Basker)

(https://archive.ph/Ww8Jd#selection-955.0-955.27:~:text=An%20Orthodox%20Jew%2C%20Mr.%20Basker)

Pearl Hart (Jewish)

(https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/hart-pearl#:~:text=Born%20to%20Russian%20Jewish%20immigrants)

(https://archive.ph/cYwL9#selection-1923.0-1923.98:~:text=Pearl%20M.%20Hart%20was%20a%20pioneering%20attorney%2C%20activist%2C%20and%20educator.%20Born%20to%20Russian%20Jewish%20immigrants)

(https://www.2civility.org/pearl-hart/#:~:text=Pearl%20Hart%20was%20born%20in%20Traverse%20City%2C%20Michigan%20in%201890%20as%20the%20fifth%20and%20only%20American%2Dborn%20daughter%20in%20a%20family%20of%20Russian%20Jewish%20Immigrants)

(https://archive.ph/Bgs6s#selection-491.0-491.140:~:text=Pearl%20Hart%20was%20born%20in%20Traverse%20City%2C%20Michigan%20in%201890%20as%20the%20fifth%20and%20only%20American%2Dborn%20daughter%20in%20a%20family%20of%20Russian%20Jewish%20Immigrants)

(https://www.womenslproject.com/blogs/news/pearl-hart#:~:text=Pearl%20Hart%20(1890%2D1975)%2C%20daughter%20of%20Russian%20Jewish%20immigrants)

(https://archive.ph/ahKB3#selection-479.0-481.51:~:text=Pearl%20Hart%20(1890%2D1975)%2C%20daughter%20of%20Russian%20Jewish%20immigrants)

Valerie Taylor (Jewish partner Parl Hart)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Valerie_Taylor_(novelist)#:~:text=Partner,Pearl%20Hart)

(https://archive.ph/R7iyh#selection-1665.0-1669.10:~:text=Partner,Pearl%20Hart)

(https://rmc.library.cornell.edu/eguides/manuscripts/7627.html#:~:text=Begins%20a%20ten%20year%20old%20relationship%20with%20Pearl%20Hart)

(https://archive.ph/bf84#selection-875.0-875.50:~:text=Begins%20a%20ten%20year%20old%20relationship%20with%20Pearl%20Hart)

Ira Jones (Not Jewish)

Bruce Scott (Not Jewish)

Janus Society

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Janus_Society#:~:text=Mae%20Polakoff%20was%20the%20group%E2%80%99s%20first%20president)

(https://archive.ph/TUGaq#selection-1511.46-1511.90:~:text=Mae%20Polakoff%20was%20the%20group%E2%80%99s%20first%20president)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Clark_Polak#:~:text=second%20president%20of%20the%20Philadelphia%2Dbased%20homophile%20organization%20called%20the%20Janus%20Society)

(https://archive.ph/hsGyo#selection-1507.13-1513.13:~:text=second%20president%20of%20the%20Philadelphia%2Dbased%20homophile%20organization%20called%20the%20Janus%20Society)

Presidents

Mae Polakoff – Nemerofsky (Jewish)

(https://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/philadelphia-lgbt-interviews/int/joey-hardman#:~:text=MS%3A%20What%20can,she%20was%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/4M6x1#selection-4889.0-4901.24:~:text=MS%3A%20What%20can,she%20was%20Jewish.)

(https://www.legacy.com/us/obituaries/legacyremembers/mae-polakoff-obituary?id=27893596#:~:text=Tuesday%2C%20June%2010%2C%202003%20at%2012%20noon%20at%20Congregation%20Beth%20Judah%20in%20Ventnor%2C%20NJ.%20Interment%20to%20follow%20at%20Rodef%20Sholom%20Cemetery%20in%20Cardiff%2C%20NJ.%20Arrangements%20by%20ROTH%2DGOLDSTEINS%20MEMORIAL%20CHAPEL%2C%20Atlantic%20City%2C%20NJ)

(https://archive.ph/laXEL#selection-283.869-283.1017:~:text=Congregation%20Beth%20Judah%20in%20Ventnor%2C%20NJ.%20Interment%20to%20follow%20at%20Rodef%20Sholom%20Cemetery%20in%20Cardiff%2C%20NJ.%20Arrangements%20by%20ROTH%2DGOLDSTEINS%20MEMORIAL%20CHAPEL)

Clark Polak (Jewish)

(https://outhistory.org/exhibits/show/philadelphia-lgbt-interviews/int/osh#:~:text=NO%3A%20His%20father,They%27re%20all%2C%20yeah)

(https://archive.ph/6wayR#selection-1109.0-1125.21:~:text=NO%3A%20His%20father,They%27re%20all%2C%20yeah)

(https://www.encyclopedia.com/social-sciences/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/polak-clark#:~:text=Polak%20was%20born%20in%201937%20to%20middle%2Dclass%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://archive.ph/bJtCk#selection-371.0-371.53:~:text=Polak%20was%20born%20in%201937%20to%20middle%2Dclass%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://research.frick.org/directory/detail/4017#:~:text=Polak%20grew%20up%20in%20a%20Jewish%20middle%2Dclass%20family)

(https://archive.ph/wAHQc#selection-3437.31-3437.90:~:text=Clark%20Phillip%20Polak%20grew%20up%20in%20a%20Jewish%20middle%2Dclass%20family)

Personal Rights in Defense and Education

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Personal_Rights_in_Defense_and_Education#:~:text=The%20organization%20was%20formed%20in%20Los%20Angeles%2C%20California%20in%201966%20by%20Steve%20Ginsburg)

(https://archive.ph/pfoPd#selection-253.66-259.14:~:text=The%20organization%20was%20formed%20in%20Los%20Angeles%2C%20California%20in%201966%20by%20Steve%20Ginsburg)

Founder

Steve Ginsburg (Jewish)

(https://glbt.i8.dgicloud.com/chutzpahflier#:~:text=Author%20(aut)%3A-,Ginsburg%2C%20Steve,-Date%20Created)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20241226234121/https://glbt.i8.dgicloud.com/chutzpahflier#:~:text=Author%20(aut)%3A-,Ginsburg%2C%20Steve,-Date%20Created)

(https://lgbtqreligiousarchives.org/collections/ginsburg-steve#:~:text=The%20Steve%20Ginsburg%20papers%20document%20his%20activities%20as%20a%20founder%20of%20Chutzpah%20(later%20Achvah)%2C%20the%20first%20gay%20Jewish%20group)

(https://archive.ph/s4Hkt#selection-339.0-339.117:~:text=The%20Steve%20Ginsburg%20papers%20document%20his%20activities%20as%20a%20founder%20of%20Chutzpah%20(later%20Achvah)%2C%20the%20first%20gay%20Jewish%20group)

(https://www.ancestry.com/last-name-meaning/ginsburg?geo-lang=en#:~:text=Ginsburg%20Surname%20Meaning-,Jewish%20(Ashkenazic),-%3A%20habitational%20name%20from)

(https://archive.ph/vBedQ#selection-379.0-379.19:~:text=Ginsburg%20Surname%20Meaning-,Jewish%20(Ashkenazic),-%3A%20habitational%20name%20from)

Eastern Regional Conference of Homophile Organizations

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Eastern_Regional_Conference_of_Homophile_Organizations#:~:text=formative%20membership%20included%20the%20Mattachine%20Society%20chapters%20in%20New%20York%20and%20Washington%20D.C.%2C%20the%20Daughters%20of%20Bilitis%20chapter%20in%20New%20York%2C%20and%20the%20Janus%20Society)

(https://archive.ph/drQxs#selection-1357.48-1367.13:~:text=formative%20membership%20included%20the%20Mattachine%20Society%20chapters%20in%20New%20York%20and%20Washington%20D.C.%2C%20the%20Daughters%20of%20Bilitis%20chapter%20in%20New%20York%2C%20and%20the%20Janus%20Society)

Founders

Mattachine Society (Jewish)

Daughters of Bilitis (Not Jewish)

Janus Society (Jewish)

North American Conference of Homophile Organizations

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/North_American_Conference_of_Homophile_Organizations#:~:text=founding%20member%20Frank%20Kameny)

(https://archive.ph/r1wvb#selection-415.52-417.12:~:text=founding%20member%20Frank%20Kameny)

Founders

Foster Gunnison Jr. (Not Jewish)

Frank Kameny (Jewish)

(https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/frank-kameny-helped-chart-part-liberation-millions-gay-americans-180987148/#:~:text=Born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20May%2021%2C%201925%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family%2C%20Kameny)

(https://archive.ph/X7ymT#selection-553.0-553.65:~:text=Born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20May%2021%2C%201925%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family%2C%20Kameny)

(https://www.queerportraits.com/bio/kameny#:~:text=He%20was%20born%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/XQ0YC#selection-789.80-789.110:~:text=He%20was%20born%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://forward.com/culture/311149/remembering-frank-kameny-the-jewish-moses-of-the-lgbt-movement/)

(https://archive.ph/J70Xg)

Total Average

Columbia Queer Alliance (Not Jewish)

Metropolitan Community Church/Council on Religion and the Homosexual (Not Jewish)

Daughters of Bilitis (Not Jewish)

Homophile Action League (Jewish)

Janus Society (Jewish)

Knights of the Clock (Not Jewish)

Mattachine Midwest (Jewish)

Mattachine Society (Jewish)

ONE, Inc. (Jewish)

PRIDE (Jewish)

Society for Human Rights (Not Jewish)

Student Homophile League (Not Jewish)

Veterans Benevolent Association (Not Jewish)

North American Conference of Homophile Organizations (Jewish)

Eastern Regional Conference of Homophile Organizations (Jewish)

8 Jewish founded/led organizations out of 15 total

53.33% Jewish

Pro-LGBTQ Intellectuals

Psychiatry writers on Pro-LGBTQ topics

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Psychiatry_writers_on_LGBTQ_topics)

(https://archive.ph/Q8cvJ)

(Charles Socarides was not pro-LGBTQ so he is not included)

Jack Drescher (Jewish)

(https://glreview.org/article/how-psychiatrists-came-around/#:~:text=I%20grew%20up%20in%20a%20Jewish%2C%20observant%20household)

(https://archive.ph/xZSVB#selection-1251.146-1251.188:~:text=I%20grew%20up%20in%20a%20Jewish%2C%20observant%20household)

(https://archive.storycorps.org/secret/jMFNZCSxKxRa3OIBJI0JZS2U90HoH0cWkwJ0kI6CdfmK7xOVfpEX9E7PbzZcgoUtke3Z3ejMRw2e6g9L450uKYEoOPYN2e4cWHwbHAq0nhxpw3OzhTEinog2N4RLSTZ4QHB1pcrq/#:~:text=Well%2C%20they%20wanted,marry%20Jewish%20girls)

(https://archive.ph/03Vro#selection-1341.116-1341.332:~:text=And%20we%20were%20sent%20to%20Hebrew%20school.%20I%20went%20to%20seven%20years%20of%20what%27s%20called%20Talmon%20Torah%2C%20which%20is%20Hebrew%20school%2C%20after%20public%20school.%20And%20we%20were%20expected%20to%20get%20good%20grades%2C%20and%20we%20were%20expected%20to%20marry%20Jewish%20girls)

Richard Friedman (Jewish)

(https://www.nytimes.com/2020/05/04/science/dr-richard-friedman-who-debunked-homosexuality-myth-dies-at-79.html#:~:text=like%20Richard%2C%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/5ew3d)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedman#:~:text=also%20adopted%20by%20Ashkenazi%20Jews%20(see%20Jewish%20surnames).%20It%20is%20the%209th%20most%20common%20surname%20in%20Israel%20(8th%20among%20Jews)%20and%20most%20common%20exclusively%20Ashkenazi%20name)

(https://archive.ph/K8NtT#selection-1815.55-1819.110:~:text=adopted%20by%20Ashkenazi%20Jews.%20It%20is%20the%209th%20most%20common%20surname%20in%20Israel%20(8th%20among%20Jews)%20and%20most%20common%20exclusively%20Ashkenazi%20name)

Richard Green (Jewish)

(https://www.theguardian.com/world/2019/apr/15/richard-green-obituary#:~:text=He%20was%20raised%20as%20a%20secular%20Jew)

(https://archive.ph/IaIdr#selection-1087.148-1087.178:~:text=He%20was%20raised%20as%20a%20secular%20Jew)

(https://www.irishtimes.com/life-and-style/people/richard-green-obituary-psychiatrist-lawyer-and-lgbt-rights-trailblazer-1.3864553#:~:text=He%20was%20raised%20as%20a%20secular%20Jew)

(https://archive.ph/jrOae#selection-1569.175-1569.205:~:text=He%20was%20raised%20as%20a%20secular%20Jew)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Green_(sexologist)#Personal_life_and_death:~:text=20th%2Dcentury%20American%20Jews)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Richard_Green_(sexologist)#Gender_role_and_sexual_orientation_research:~:text=20th%2Dcentury%20American%20Jews)

Richard Isay (Jewish, father of David Isay)

(https://www.wikitree.com/wiki/Isay-2#:~:text=Richard%20Isay%20has%20Jewish%20Roots)

(https://archive.ph/UE71K#selection-1776.1-1781.29:~:text=Richard%20Isay%20has%20Jewish%20Roots)

(https://current.org/2001/04/audio-producer-david-isay-curiosity-respect-trust/#:~:text=totally%20into%20being%20a%20Jewish%20person)

(https://archive.ph/JuzYt#selection-1089.72-1089.106:~:text=totally%20into%20being%20a%20Jewish%20person)

(https://onbeing.org/programs/david-isay-listening-as-an-act-of-love/#:~:text=Yeah%2C%20I%20went%20to%20Hebrew%20school%20when%20I%20was%20a%20kid.%20And%20I%20didn%E2%80%99t%20connect%20at%20all.%20I%20think%20I%E2%80%99m%20culturally%20Jewish)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20250820231057/https://onbeing.org/programs/david-isay-listening-as-an-act-of-love/#:~:text=Yeah%2C%20I%20went%20to%20Hebrew%20school%20when%20I%20was%20a%20kid.%20And%20I%20didn%E2%80%99t%20connect%20at%20all.%20I%20think%20I%E2%80%99m%20culturally%20Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/David_Isay#:~:text=20th%2Dcentury%20American%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/tnGsZ#selection-3623.0-3623.26:~:text=20th%2Dcentury%20American%20Jews)

Marshall Kirk (Not Jewish)

Fritz Klein (Jewish)

(https://www.jmw.at/en/news/pride_month_the_life_and_works_of_dr_fritz_klein__an_austrian_american_sex_researcher#:~:text=Born%20to%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/Ion1A#selection-1187.417-1187.450:~:text=Born%20to%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1488768/#:~:text=born%20into%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/0I5l5#selection-989.0-989.51:~:text=Fritz%20Klein%20was%20born%20into%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://www.theguardian.com/news/2006/jun/19/guardianobituaries.mainsection#:~:text=Klein%20was%20born%20to%20orthodox%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://archive.ph/A5KWJ#selection-1161.0-1161.41:~:text=Klein%20was%20born%20to%20orthodox%20Jewish%20parents)

Richard von Krafft-Ebing (Not Jewish)

Richard Pillard (Not Jewish)

Sophus Thalbitzer (Not Jewish)

5 Jews out of 9 total

55.55% Jewish

Medical writers on Pro-LGBTQ topics

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Category:Medical_writers_on_LGBTQ_topics)

(https://archive.ph/7Xgus)

(Irving Bieber and Edmund Bergler were not pro-homosexuality so they are not included)

Arnold Aletrino (Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Arnold_Aletrino#:~:text=Dutch%20Sephardi%20Jews-,LGBTQ%20Jews,-1858%20births)

(https://archive.ph/Quuop#selection-995.0-995.13:~:text=from%20the%20Netherlands-,Sephardi%20Jews,-Navigation%20menu)

(https://www.dutchjewry.org/drieluik/jewish_artists/jewish_artists.shtml#:~:text=Arnold%20Aletrino%20(1858%2D1916))

(https://archive.ph/4Hm7b#selection-2003.0-2003.27:~:text=Arnold%20Aletrino%20(1858%2D1916)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Aron-Arnold-Aletrino/6000000015443811075#:~:text=In%20English%3A-,On%20April%201%2C%201858%20Arnold%20Aletrino%20was%20born%20the%20second%20son,his%20father%20was%20part%20of%20the%20Portuguese%20Jewish%20community%20in%20Amsterdam,-%2C%20he%20was%20a)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20250416181920/https://www.geni.com/people/Aron-Arnold-Aletrino/6000000015443811075#:~:text=In%20English%3A-,On%20April%201%2C%201858%20Arnold%20Aletrino%20was%20born%20the%20second%20son,Pinedo.%20Although%20his%20father%20was%20part%20of%20the%20Portuguese%20Jewish%20community,-in%20Amsterdam%2C%20he)

Ernst Burchard (Not Jewish)

Havelock Ellis (Not Jewish)

Magnus Hirschfeld (Jewish)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1063.0-1063.111:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/magnus-hirschfeld-and-the-institute-for-sexual-science/#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/lbWys#selection-199.0-199.83:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/zvzTB#selection-303.0-303.84:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

2 Jews out of 4 total

50% Jewish

Pro-LGBTQ Notable Sexologists

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sexology#Notable_contributors:~:text=%5B31%5D-,Notable%20contributors,-%5Bedit%5D)

(https://archive.ph/zTbxb#selection-3919.0-3919.7:~:text=%5B31%5D-,Notable,-contributors%E2%80%8B%5B)

(Gaston Vorberg, Clelia Duel Mosher, Ernst Gräfenberg, Bronisław Malinowski, Theodor Reik, Wilhelm Reich, William Masters, Gershon Legman, Harold Lief, Alex Comfort, Virginia Johnson, Beverly Whipple and Kenneth Zucker removed due to not being pro-LGBT relative to their time or not writing about it)

Karl Heinrich Ulrichs (Not Jewish)

Karl Friedrich Otto Westphal (Not Jewish)

Richard Freiherr von Krafft-Ebing (Not Jewish)

Albert Eulenburg (Jewish)

(https://dokumen.pub/berlin-electropolis-shock-nerves-and-german-modernity-9780520931633.html: Berlin Electropolis: Shock, Nerves, and German Modernity page 64)

(https://www.jewishencyclopedia.com/articles/5902-eulenburg-albert)

(https://archive.ph/eE0AU)

(https://cris.maastrichtuniversity.nl/ws/portalfiles/portal/77658110/Oosterhuis_2019_Molls_Ambivalence_Homosexuality.pdf: Albert Moll's Ambivalence about Homosexuality and His Marginalization as a Sexual Pioneer page 3)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Albert_Eulenburg#:~:text=Born%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/yNr3s#selection-1305.0-1309.7:~:text=Born%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

Auguste Henri Forel (Not Jewish)

Sigmund Freud (Jewish)

(https://www.nybooks.com/articles/1991/12/05/how-jewish-was-freud/)

(https://archive.ph/qBjny)

(https://www.anumuseum.org.il/blog/sigmund-freud/)

(https://archive.ph/xQmch)

(https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/19585296/#:~:text=Freud%2C%20despite%20a%20deliberate%20attempt%20to%20play%20down%20his%20Jewish%20origins%20to%20deflect%20anti%2DSemitic%20attacks%2C%20is%20the%20most%20representative%20Jew%20of%20his%20time)

(https://archive.ph/k1GZB#selection-2167.14-2167.157:~:text=Freud%2C%20despite%20a%20deliberate%20attempt%20to%20play%20down%20his%20Jewish%20origins%20to%20deflect%20anti%2DSemitic%20attacks%2C%20is%20the%20most%20representative%20Jew%20of%20his%20time)

Wilhelm Fliess (Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wilhelm_Fliess#:~:text=19th%2Dcentury%20German%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/Njx55#selection-1561.0-1561.11:~:text=German%20sexologists-,German%20Jews,-Jewish%20physicians)

(https://psycnet.apa.org/record/2007-10347-008#:~:text=Wilhelm%20Fliess%2C%20a%20Jewish%20physician)

(https://archive.ph/E7dN2#selection-787.2010-787.2044:~:text=Wilhelm%20Fliess%2C%20a%20Jewish%20physician)

(https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/179489234/wilhelm-fliess#:~:text=He%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20otolaryngologist)

(https://archive.ph/V6w3u#selection-711.0-711.39:~:text=He%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20otolaryngologist)

(https://www.encyclopedia.com/psychology/dictionaries-thesauruses-pictures-and-press-releases/fliess-wilhelm-1858-1928#:~:text=He%20came%20from%20a%20family%20of%20Sephardic%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/BnMDf#selection-363.22-363.61:~:text=He%20came%20from%20a%20family%20of%20Sephardic%20Jews)

Havelock Ellis (Not Jewish)

Eugen Steinach (Jewish)

(https://embryo.asu.edu/pages/eugen-steinach-1861-1944#:~:text=Steinach%20and%20his%20wife%2C%20who%20were%20both%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/A30Vk#selection-753.147-753.190:~:text=Steinach%20and%20his%20wife%2C%20who%20were%20both%20Jewish)

(https://karger.com/uin/article/104/7-8/501/302216/He-Gave-Us-the-Cornerstone-of-Sexual-Medicine-A#:~:text=Eugen%20Steinach%20was%20born%20in%201861%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/ctlwF#selection-2687.0-2687.52:~:text=Eugen%20Steinach%20was%20born%20in%201861%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://www.jta.org/archive/dr-eugene-steinach-authority-on-gland-rejuvenation-dies-in-switzerland#:~:text=Dr.%20Steinach%2C%20whose%20theories%20aroused%20much%20controversy%20in%20medical%20circles%2C%20was%20born%20in%20the%20town%20of%20Hohenems%2C%20in%20the%20Austrian%20Tyrol%2C%20where%20his%20family%20had%20been%20prominent%20in%20Jewish%20affairs%20for%20several%20generations)

(https://archive.ph/3dSd3#selection-819.184-819.392:~:text=Dr.%20Steinach%2C%20whose%20theories%20aroused%20much%20controversy%20in%20medical%20circles%2C%20was%20born%20in%20the%20town%20of%20Hohenems%2C%20in%20the%20Austrian%20Tyrol%2C%20where%20his%20family%20had%20been%20prominent%20in%20Jewish%20affairs%20for%20several%20generations)

Robert Dickinson (Not Jewish)

Albert Moll (Jewish)

(https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3381530/#:~:text=Moll%20came%20from%20a%20family%20of%20merchants%20in%20Lissa/Posen%2C%20Hirschfeld%20from%20a%20family%20of%20doctors%20in%20Kolberg/Pomerania.%20Both%20belonged%20to%20the%20same%20generation%2C%20grew%20up%20as%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/1fgxc#selection-1765.145-1765.309:~:text=Moll%20came%20from%20a%20family%20of%20merchants%20in%20Lissa/Posen%2C%20Hirschfeld%20from%20a%20family%20of%20doctors%20in%20Kolberg/Pomerania.%20Both%20belonged%20to%20the%20same%20generation%2C%20grew%20up%20as%20Jews)

(https://resolve.cambridge.org/core/journals/medical-history/article/sexologicaldeliberation-and-social-engineering-albert-moll-and-the-sterilisation-debate-inlate-imperial-and-weimar-germany/D1F99280AD406F9F45C973006D5351BB#:~:text=The%20Jewish%2Dborn%20physician%20and%20sexologist%20Albert%20Moll)

(https://archive.ph/CEA8x#selection-2291.1-2291.53:~:text=The%20Jewish%2Dborn%20physician%20and%20sexologist%20Albert%20Moll)

(https://newsonline.library.vanderbilt.edu/2024/08/albert-moll-hypnotism-collection-now-fully-cataloged/#:~:text=Moll%2C%20who%20was%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/L2yeM)

Edvard Westermarck (Not Jewish)

Eugene Wilhelm (Not Jewish)

Magnus Hirschfeld (Jewish)

(https://encyclopedia.ushmm.org/content/en/article/magnus-hirschfeld-2#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://archive.ph/yYkVl#selection-1063.0-1063.111:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%20and%20a%20leading%20researcher%20of%20sex%2C%20sexuality%2C%20and%20gender)

(https://blog.sciencemuseum.org.uk/magnus-hirschfeld-and-the-institute-for-sexual-science/#:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/lbWys#selection-199.0-199.83:~:text=Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%20%E2%80%93%201935)%20was%20a%20German%20Jewish%20doctor%2C%20sexologist%20and%20activist)

(https://www.scientificamerican.com/article/the-forgotten-history-of-the-worlds-first-trans-clinic/#:~:text=Hirschfeld%20understood%20the%20soldier%E2%80%99s%20plight%E2%80%94he%20was%20himself%20both%20homosexual%20and%20Jewish)

Iwan Bloch (Jewish)

(https://forward.com/schmooze/161446/the-einsteins-of-sex/#:~:text=trio%20of%20German%20Jewish%20sexologists%20preceded%20Sigmund%20Freud%20in%20innovations.%20Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%3B%20Iwan%20Bloch)

(https://archive.ph/mdc5B#selection-717.20-717.134:~:text=trio%20of%20German%20Jewish%20sexologists%20preceded%20Sigmund%20Freud%20in%20innovations.%20Magnus%20Hirschfeld%20(1868%E2%80%931935)%3B%20Iwan%20Bloch)

(https://www.online-ofb.de/famreport.php?ofb=juden_nw&ID=I4794&lang=en)

(https://archive.ph/JLdtz)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Iwan_Bloch#:~:text=Bloch%20came%20from%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/wzEer#selection-1623.0-1623.31:~:text=Bloch%20came%20from%20a%20Jewish%20family)

Theodoor Hendrik van de Velde (Not Jewish)

Max Marcuse (Jewish)

(https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/37656185/#:~:text=Emigration%20of%20Jewish%20scientists)

(https://archive.ph/Da79D#selection-2345.14-2345.45:~:text=Emigration%20of%20Jewish%20scientists)

(https://www.deutsche-biographie.de/11676791X.html?language=en#:~:text=Religious%20Denomination,Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/3fFqY#selection-455.0-463.6:~:text=Religious%20Denomination,Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Max_Marcuse#:~:text=Dermatologists-,Jewish%20physicians,-Jewish%20emigrants%20from)

(https://archive.ph/pK0Of#selection-2041.0-2041.17:~:text=Dermatologists-,Jewish%20physicians,-Jewish%20emigrants%20from)

(https://lastnames.myheritage.com/last-name/marcuse#:~:text=The%20surname%20Marcuse%20has%20its%20roots%20in%20the%20Jewish%20communities%20of%20Europe%2C%20particularly%20among%20Ashkenazi%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/1iPdd)

Otto Gross (Jewish partner Marianne Kuh, sister of Anton Kuh)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Marianne-Kuh/6000000016934899535#:~:text=Partner%20of%20Dr.%20med.%20Otto%20Hans%20Adolf%20Gross)

(https://archive.ph/2PDTF#selection-1309.1-1311.30:~:text=Partner%20of%20Dr.%20med.%20Otto%20Hans%20Adolf%20Gross)

(https://www.geni.com/people/Anton-Kuh/6000000024516313529#:~:text=Georg%20Kuh%3B-,Marianne%20%22Mizzi%22%20Kuh%3B,-Johannes%20Johann%20Kuh)

(https://archive.ph/ULjpn#selection-1367.0-1369.1:~:text=Marianne%20%22Mizzi%22%20Kuh%3B)

(https://www.archive.jewishnews.at/jewish-news-from-austria-22/an-evening-in-the-epstein-palace-with-texts-by-anton-kuh.html#:~:text=Anton%20Kuh%20came%20from%20a%20German%2DJewish%20family%20in%20Prague)

(https://archive.ph/rHgTA#selection-281.25-281.77:~:text=Anton%20Kuh%20came%20from%20a%20German%2DJewish%20family%20in%20Prague)

(https://www.fwf.ac.at/en/research-radar/10.55776/P18162#:~:text=The%20life%20and%20work%20of%20Jewish%20journalist%20Anton%20Kuh)

(https://archive.ph/qEBST#selection-3375.0-3375.48:~:text=Final%20report-,The%20life%20and%20work%20of%20Jewish%20journalist%20Anton%20Kuh,-(Vienna%201890%2DNew)

(https://www.encyclopedia.com/religion/encyclopedias-almanacs-transcripts-and-maps/kuh-anton#:~:text=Coming%20from%20a%20Prague%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/BnW4b#selection-363.46-363.80:~:text=Coming%20from%20a%20Prague%20Jewish%20family)

Harry Benjamin (Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Harry_Benjamin#:~:text=German%20people%20of%20Jewish%20descent)

(https://archive.ph/soWBm#selection-4867.0-4867.31:~:text=German%20people%20of%20Jewish%20descent)

(https://contingentmagazine.org/2024/07/28/harry-benjamin-the-maverick/#:~:text=his%20father%E2%80%99s%20Jewish%20heritage)

(https://archive.ph/akwiU#selection-581.463-581.491:~:text=his%20father%E2%80%99s%20Jewish%20heritage)

(https://scispace.com/pdf/putting-patients-first-harry-benjamin-and-the-development-of-3e54a9lnt3.pdf: Putting Patients First: Harry Benjamin and the Development of Transgender Medicine in the Twentieth Century page 33)

Hans Blüher (Not Jewish)

Alfred Kinsey (Not Jewish)

Mary Calderone (Not Jewish)

Wardell Pomeroy (Not Jewish)

Albert Ellis (Jewish)

(https://jewishcurrents.org/rational-emotive-behavioral-therapy-jewish-thought#:~:text=Ellis%20was%20born%20to%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://archive.ph/k8IDu#selection-477.1415-477.1447:~:text=Ellis%20was%20born%20to%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://americanhumanist.org/press-releases/2007-07-albert-ellis-1971-humanist-of-the-year-mourned/#:~:text=Ellis%20was%20born%20on%20September%2027%2C%201913%2C%20in%20Pittsburgh%2C%20Pennsylvania%2C%20to%20a%20Reformed%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/8XJ2r#selection-953.0-953.94:~:text=Ellis%20was%20born%20on%20September%2027%2C%201913%2C%20in%20Pittsburgh%2C%20Pennsylvania%2C%20to%20a%20Reformed%20Jewish%20family)

(https://www.rebtnetwork.org/library/personalreflections.html#:~:text=Albert%20Ellis%20was%20born%20to%20a%20Jewish%20mother)

(https://archive.ph/EUcD#selection-475.0-475.40:~:text=Albert%20Ellis%20was%20born%20to%20a%20Jewish%20mother)

(https://www.rebt.ws/albertellisbiography.html#:~:text=Albert%20Ellis%20was%20born%20of%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://archive.ph/7to0#selection-49.1-49.40:~:text=Albert%20Ellis%20was%20born%20of%20Jewish%20parents)

Kurt Freund (Jewish)

(https://www.taylorfrancis.com/chapters/edit/10.4324/9781315881089-64/paraphilia-scales-kurt-freund-erotic-preferences-examination-scheme-blanchard#:~:text=Freund%20was%20born%20into%20a%20German%2Dspeaking%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/nevEH#selection-701.190-701.243:~:text=Freund%20was%20born%20into%20a%20German%2Dspeaking%20Jewish%20family)

(https://english.radio.cz/mailbox-8541951#:~:text=Kurt%20Freund%20was%20born%20into%20a%20German%20speaking%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/KMv2F#selection-1009.92-1009.149:~:text=Kurt%20Freund%20was%20born%20into%20a%20German%20speaking%20Jewish%20family)

(https://entities.oclc.org/worldcat/entity/E39PBJk8XMqThCXQKKJTdKBpT3.html#:~:text=English-,Kurt%20Freund,Jewish%20pychiatrist%20and%20sexologist,-0)

(https://archive.ph/JJQ1Y#selection-547.0-551.18:~:text=English-,Kurt%20Freund,Jewish%20pychiatrist,-and%20sexologist)

(https://www.jewage.org/wiki/he/Article:Kurt_Freund_-_Biography)

(https://archive.ph/CzHKK)

Ernest Borneman (Jewish)

(https://www.wallstein-verlag.de/english/9783835316737.html#:~:text=Borneman%2C%20a%20young%20communist%20with%20a%20Jewish%20family%20background)

(https://archive.ph/QQtm0#selection-953.164-953.223:~:text=Borneman%2C%20a%20young%20communist%20with%20a%20Jewish%20family%20background)

(https://onesearch.library.northeastern.edu/discovery/fulldisplay?docid=alma9952225838101401&context=L&vid=01NEU_INST:NU&lang=en&search_scope=MyInst_and_CI&adaptor=Local%20Search%20Engine&tab=Everything&query=sub,contains,%20%20Music%20critics%20,AND&mode=advanced&offset=0#:~:text=Borneman%27s%20journey%20from%20a%20young%20Jewish%20Communist)

(https://archive.ph/swLzB#selection-2469.316-2469.364:~:text=English%20translation%2C%20acclaimed%20historian%20Detlef%20Siegfried%20chronicles-,Borneman%27s%20journey%20from%20a%20young%20Jewish%20Communist,-in%20Nazi%20Berlin%20to%20his%20emergence%20as)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ernest_Borneman#:~:text=Jewish%20emigrants%20from%20Nazi%20Germany%20to%20the%20United%20Kingdom)

(https://archive.ph/PtjOR#selection-2917.0-2917.56:~:text=Jewish%20emigrants%20from%20Nazi%20Germany%20to%20the%20United%20Kingdom)

(https://wiki.yesmap.net/wiki/Ernest_Borneman#:~:text=As%20both%20a%20Jew%20and%20a%20member%20of%20the%20German%20Communist%20Party)

(https://archive.ph/d3Zdw#selection-137.81-137.137:~:text=As%20both%20a%20Jew%20and%20a%20member%20of%20the%20German%20Communist%20Party)

Paul Gebhard (Not Jewish)

Lykke Aresin (Not Jewish)

John Money (Not Jewish)

Robert Stoller (Jewish), coined the term “Gender Identity”

(https://www.encyclopedia.com/psychology/dictionaries-thesauruses-pictures-and-press-releases/stoller-robert-j-1925-1991#:~:text=He%20was%20born%20and%20raised%20in%20suburban%20New%20York%20to%20Russian%2DJewish%20immigrant%20parents)

(https://archive.ph/AFant#selection-449.0-455.36:~:text=He%20was%20born%20and%20raised%20in%20suburban%20New%20York%20to%20Russian%2DJewish%20immigrant%20parents)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Stoller#:~:text=Robert%20Stoller%20was%20born%20on%20December%2015%2C%201924%2C%20in%20Crestwood%2C%20New%20York.%20His%20parents%20were%20Russian%2DJewish%20immigrants)

(https://archive.ph/1nsgC#selection-1775.0-1779.44:~:text=Robert%20Stoller%20was%20born%20on%20December%2015%2C%201924%2C%20in%20Crestwood%2C%20New%20York.%20His%20parents%20were%20Russian%2DJewish%20immigrants)

(https://www.ancestry.com/last-name-meaning/stoller#:~:text=German%20and%20Jewish%20(Ashkenazic)

(https://archive.ph/FB2PG#selection-327.0-327.30:~:text=German%20and%20Jewish%20(Ashkenazic)

Ira Reiss (Jewish)

(https://www.jewage.org/wiki/en/Article:Ira_Reiss_-_Biography)

(https://archive.ph/bB3DJ)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ira_Reiss#:~:text=Jewish%20American%20sociologists)

(https://archive.ph/dgaM8#selection-4241.0-4241.28:~:text=Jewish%20American%20sociologists)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Reiss_(name)#:~:text=most%20commonly%20used%20by%20Ashkenazic%20Jewish%20people%20as%20a%20metonymic%20occupational%20name%20for%20a%20dealer%20in%20rice%20(Yiddish%20%D7%A8%D7%B2%D6%B7%D7%96)

(https://archive.ph/ijezS#selection-1517.9-1539.6:~:text=and%20was%20most%20commonly%20used%20by%20Ashkenazic%20Jewish%20people%20as%20a%20metonymic%20occupational%20name%20for%20a%20dealer%20in%20rice%20(Yiddish%20%D7%A8%D7%B2%D6%B7%D7%96)

Preben Hertoft (Not Jewish)

Oswalt Kolle (Jewish partner Horst Buchholz)

(https://www.nndb.com/people/890/000131497/#:~:text=In%20his%20autobiography%2C%20Oswalt%20Kolle%2C%20Ich%20bin%20so%20frei%3A%20mein%20Leben%20(2008)%2C%20claims%20to%20have%20had%20a%20relationship%20with%20Buchholz)

(https://archive.ph/kL0W4#selection-303.52-307.56:~:text=In%20his%20autobiography%2C%20Oswalt%20Kolle%2C%20Ich%20bin%20so%20frei%3A%20mein%20Leben%20(2008)%2C%20claims%20to%20have%20had%20a%20relationship%20with%20Buchholz)

(https://www.profil.at/home/autobiografie-sexpapst-kolle-218306#:~:text=He%20had%20brief%20affairs%20with%20O.E.%20Hasse%20and%20Horst%20Buchholz)

(https://archive.ph/bpNDm#selection-1513.139-1513.194:~:text=He%20had%20brief%20affairs%20with%20O.E.%20Hasse%20and%20Horst%20Buchholz)

(https://de.wikipedia.org/wiki/Oswalt_Kolle#:~:text=he%20also%20had%20relationships%20with%20Horst%20Buchholz)

(https://archive.ph/JFnJw#selection-2477.3-2485.14:~:text=he%20also%20had%20relationships%20with%20Horst%20Buchholz)

(https://www.nndb.com/lists/481/000045346/#:~:text=Horst%20Buchholz,The%20Magnificent%20Seven)

(https://archive.ph/NMgT8#selection-6171.0-6205.21:~:text=Horst%20Buchholz,The%20Magnificent%20Seven)

(https://www.naijanews.com/buzz/people/career-biography-and-origin-of-personality-horst-buchholz/#:~:text=Horst%20Buchholz%20was%20a%20German%20actor%20of%20Jewish%20origin)

(https://archive.ph/mjn5n)

(https://www.astrotheme.com/astrology/Horst_Buchholz#:~:text=His%20paternal%20grandparents%20were%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/tUKeA#selection-9887.53-9887.90:~:text=His%20paternal%20grandparents%20were%20Jewish)

(https://www.ancestry.com/last-name-meaning/buchholz#:~:text=Alsace%20and%20Lorraine).-,Jewish%20(Ashkenazic),-%3A%20artificial%20name%20from)

(https://archive.ph/z7bmy#selection-373.0-373.19:~:text=Alsace%20and%20Lorraine).-,Jewish%20(Ashkenazic),-%3A%20artificial%20name%20from)

Vern Bullough (Not Jewish)

Ruth Westheimer (Jewish)

(https://www.jnf.org/jnf-blog/post/blog/dr.-ruth-zionist#:~:text=Karola%20Ruth%20Westheimer%20was%20born%20in%201928%20in%20the%20German%20village%20of%20Weisenfeld%20and%20raised%20in%20Frankfort.%20The%20only%20child%20of%20an%20orthodox%20Jewish%20family%2C%20she%20attended%20synagogue%20regularly%20with%20her%20father)

(https://archive.ph/GP1uu#selection-959.0-959.194:~:text=Karola%20Ruth%20Westheimer%20was%20born%20in%201928%20in%20the%20German%20village%20of%20Weisenfeld%20and%20raised%20in%20Frankfort.%20The%20only%20child%20of%20an%20orthodox%20Jewish%20family%2C%20she%20attended%20synagogue%20regularly%20with%20her%20father)

(https://www.kveller.com/dr-ruth-westheimer-jewish-life-is-a-blessing/#:~:text=%E2%80%9CI%E2%80%99m%20a%20Jewish%20angel%2C%20but%20that%E2%80%99s%20OK%2C%E2%80%9D%20Westheimer%20responds%20fondly)

(https://archive.ph/RzmFM#selection-1537.0-1537.63:~:text=%E2%80%9CI%E2%80%99m%20a%20Jewish%20angel%2C%20but%20that%E2%80%99s%20OK%2C%E2%80%9D%20Westheimer%20responds%20fondly)

(https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/westheimer-ruth)

(https://archive.ph/oHKx0)

John Gagnon (Not Jewish)

Fritz Klein (Jewish)

(https://www.jmw.at/en/news/pride_month_the_life_and_works_of_dr_fritz_klein__an_austrian_american_sex_researcher#:~:text=Born%20to%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/Ion1A#selection-1187.417-1187.450:~:text=Born%20to%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC1488768/#:~:text=born%20into%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/0I5l5#selection-989.0-989.51:~:text=Fritz%20Klein%20was%20born%20into%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20family)

(https://www.theguardian.com/news/2006/jun/19/guardianobituaries.mainsection#:~:text=Klein%20was%20born%20to%20orthodox%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://archive.ph/A5KWJ#selection-1161.0-1161.41:~:text=Klein%20was%20born%20to%20orthodox%20Jewish%20parents)

Ava Cadell (Jewish spouse Peter Knecht)

(https://www.bearmanormedia.com/blogs/news/10-questions-with-dr-ava-cadell-editor-of-blood-justice-on-the-sunset-strip-and-widow-of-the-late-peter-knecht?srsltid=AfmBOorL8RAOg4sgyvMacEzJDlyb1X2NHrqkCPZVXEGVMohMYFnnlmSV#:~:text=his%20Austrian%20parents%20and%20their%20experience%20as%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/A3EZC#selection-585.235-585.284:~:text=his%20Austrian%20parents%20and%20their%20experience%20as%20Jews)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Ava_Cadell#:~:text=Spouse,Peter%20Knecht)

(https://archive.ph/OJpCl#selection-1837.0-1845.24:~:text=Spouse,2014)%20(his%20death)

Milton Diamond (Jewish)

(https://www.hawaii.edu/PCSS/obituary/index.html#:~:text=Dr.%20Diamond%20was%20born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20March%206%2C%201934%2C%20the%20third%20and%20youngest%20child%20of%20Jewish%20Ukrainian%20immigrants)

(https://archive.ph/uABOf#selection-129.0-129.117:~:text=Dr.%20Diamond%20was%20born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20March%206%2C%201934%2C%20the%20third%20and%20youngest%20child%20of%20Jewish%20Ukrainian%20immigrants)

(https://www.nytimes.com/2024/05/08/health/milton-diamond-dead.html)

(https://archive.ph/orH8Q#selection-7105.0-7105.122:~:text=Milton%20Diamond%20was%20born%20on%20March%206%2C%201934%2C%20in%20the%20Bronx%20to%20Aaron%20and%20Jennie%20(Arber)%20Diamond%2C%20Jewish%20immigrants%20from%20Ukraine)

(https://www.cambridge.org/core/journals/twin-research-and-human-genetics/article/tribute-to-dr-milton-diamond-twin-studies-of-transsexualitytwin-research-reviews-loss-of-a-twin-brother-recent-memoir-oxytocin-adminstration-during-twin-delivery-models-of-monochorionic-twinning-twins-brain-responses-to-watching-filmshuman-interest-oldest-conjoined-twins-pass-away-twins-discordant-for-child-abuse-twins-married-to-twins-rare-quadruplet-set-delivered-questions-of-coincidence-rearedapart-twin-valedictorians/D5FD4148C471060DCCB2619318CAAE2E#:~:text=Mickey%20Diamond%20was%20born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20March%206%2C%201934.%20He%20was%20one%20of%20three%20children%20of%20Jewish%20immigrants)

(https://archive.ph/BTeS6#selection-2257.1-2257.109:~:text=Mickey%20Diamond%20was%20born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20March%206%2C%201934.%20He%20was%20one%20of%20three%20children%20of%20Jewish%20immigrants)

Erwin Haeberle (Not Jewish)

Marco Denegri (Not Jewish)

Gunter Schmidt (Not Jewish)

Rolf Gindorf (Not Jewish)

Volkmar Sigusch (Not Jewish)

Martin Dannecker (Not Jewish)

Shere Hite (Not Jewish)

Ray Blanchard (Not Jewish)

Pepper Schwartz (Jewish)

(https://digitalcollections.lib.washington.edu/digital/collection/ohc/id/3922/#:~:text=Pepper%20Schwartz%2C%20who%20became%20a%20sociology%20professor%20at%20the%20University%20of%20Washington%20in%201972%2C%20reflects%20on%20her%20upbringing%20in%20a%20liberal%20Jewish%20home)

(https://archive.ph/Rm0n6#selection-461.5-467.142:~:text=Pepper%20Schwartz%2C%20who%20became%20a%20sociology%20professor%20at%20the%20University%20of%20Washington%20in%201972%2C%20reflects%20on%20her%20upbringing%20in%20a%20liberal%20Jewish%20home)

(https://gwssarchive.ds.lib.uw.edu/gwss/items/show/35#:~:text=Pepper%20Schwartz%2C%20who%20became%20a%20sociology%20professor%20at%20the%20University%20of%20Washington%20in%201972%2C%20reflects%20on%20her%20upbringing%20in%20a%20liberal%20Jewish%20home)

(https://archive.ph/g0kNs#selection-1275.0-1275.142:~:text=Pepper%20Schwartz%2C%20who%20became%20a%20sociology%20professor%20at%20the%20University%20of%20Washington%20in%201972%2C%20reflects%20on%20her%20upbringing%20in%20a%20liberal%20Jewish%20home)

(https://screenrant.com/married-at-first-sight-dr-pepper-schwartz-everything-know/#:~:text=Dr.%20Pepper%2C%20who%20comes%20from%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/SpFoN#selection-1711.4-1711.42:~:text=Pepper%2C%20who%20comes%20from%20a%20Jewish%20family)

Gilbert Herdt (Not Jewish)

Pan Suiming (Not Jewish)

Carol Queen (Jewish partner)

(https://archive.org/details/isbn_9781573440837/page/8/mode/2up?: The Oy of Sex: Jewish Women Write Erotica page 9, 50)

Page 9: “The idea for a book of erotic fiction by and about Jewish women...”

Page 50: In Carol Queen’s section: “She (her partner) always got nervous when they said: ‘You're from New York City, arntcha?’ She insisted this was code for ‘You're a Jew huh?’ A naive shiksa. (shiksa is a pejorative term used by Jews for a female Gentile) I wasn't sure the hicks I grew up with knew a Jew when they saw one.”

James Cantor (Jewish)

(https://x.com/JamesCantorPhD/status/1461749025305202689)

(https://archive.ph/ka34H)

(https://www.theguardian.com/world/2024/nov/21/supreme-court-trans-rights-doctors-testimonies-bias#:~:text=he%20is%20a%20%E2%80%9Cgay%20Jewish%20atheist%20Canadian%20citizen)

(https://archive.ph/nRcTO#selection-1691.132-1691.176:~:text=he%20is%20a%20%E2%80%9Cgay%20Jewish%20atheist%20Canadian%20citizen)

(https://thewalrus.ca/why-would-someone-choose-to-be-a-monster/#:~:text=he%20has%20a%20serious%20case%20of%20what%20he%20calls%20%E2%80%9Cmiddle%2Daged%20Jewish%20face%2C%E2%80%9D)

(https://archive.ph/ZzTE0#selection-739.288-739.353:~:text=he%20has%20a%20serious%20case%20of%20what%20he%20calls%20%E2%80%9Cmiddle%2Daged%20Jewish%20face%2C%E2%80%9D)

Marta Crawford (Not Jewish)

23 Jews out of 53 total

43.39% Jewish

Total Average

Psychiatry Writers on Pro-LGBTQ Topics

5 Jews

4 Non-Jews

9 Total

55.55% Jewish

Medical Writers on Pro-LGBTQ Topics

2 Jews

2 Non-Jews

4 Total

50%

Pro-LGBTQ Notable Sexologists

23 Jews

30 Non-Jews

53 Total

43.39% Jewish

Total Average:

30 Jews

36 Non-Jews

66 Total

45.45% Jewish

The Removal of Homosexuality from The DSM

Out of DSM: Depathologizing Homosexuality: 7. The 1973 APA Decision

(https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC4695779/#:~:text=severe%20psychological%20disturbances.-,7.%20The%201973%20APA%20Decision,-American%20psychiatry%20mostly)

(https://archive.ph/RtlUx#sec7-behavsci-05-00565)

"...Other **gay activists**, however, forcefully rejected the pathological model as a major contributor to the stigma associated with homosexuality. **It was this latter group that brought modern sex research theories to the attention of APA.** In the wake of the 1969 Stonewall riots in New York City, gay and lesbian activists, believing psychiatric theories to be a major contributor to anti-homosexual social stigma, disrupted the 1970 and 1971 annual meetings of the APA.

...There was also an emerging generational changing of the guard within APA comprised of younger leaders urging the organization to greater social consciousness. A very few psychoanalysts like **Judd Marmor** were also taking issue with psychoanalytic orthodoxy regarding homosexuality. **However, the most significant catalyst for diagnostic change was gay activism.**

Gay activist protests succeeded in getting APA's attention and led to unprecedented educational panels at the group's next two annual meetings. A 1971 panel, entitled "Gay is Good," featured gay activists **Frank Kameny** and **Barbara Gittings** explaining to psychiatrists, many who were hearing this for the first time, the stigma caused by the "homosexuality" diagnosis. Kameny and Gittings returned to speak at the 1972 meeting, this time joined by **John Fryer**, M.D. Fryer appeared as Dr. H Anonymous, a "homosexual psychiatrist" who, given the realistic fear of adverse professional consequences for coming out at that time, disguised his true identity from the audience and spoke of the discrimination gay psychiatrists faced in their own profession.

While protests and panels took place, APA engaged in an internal deliberative process of considering the question of whether homosexuality should remain a psychiatric diagnosis. This included a symposium at the 1973 APA annual meeting in which participants favoring and opposing removal debated the question, "Should Homosexuality be in the APA Nomenclature?". The Nomenclature Committee, APA's scientific body addressing this issue also wrestled with the question of what constitutes a mental disorder. **Robert Spitzer**, who chaired a subcommittee looking into the issue, "reviewed the characteristics of the various mental disorders and concluded that, with the exception of homosexuality and perhaps some of the other 'sexual deviations', they all regularly caused subjective distress or were associated with generalized impairment in social effectiveness of functioning". Having arrived at this novel definition of mental disorder, the Nomenclature Committee agreed that homosexuality per se was not one. Several other APA committees and deliberative bodies then reviewed and accepted their work and recommendations. As a result, in **December 1973, APA's Board of Trustees** (BOT) voted to remove homosexuality from the DSM."

Judd Marmor (Jewish)

(https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2003-dec-20-me-marmor20-story.html#:~:text=Marmor%20was%20born%20in%201910%20in%20London%2C%20the%20son%20of%20a%20Yiddish%20scholar)

(https://archive.ph/SpD8y#selection-2759.0-2759.63:~:text=Marmor%20was%20born%20in%201910%20in%20London%2C%20the%20son%20of%20a%20Yiddish%20scholar)

(https://www.apaf.org/library-archives/president-s-of-the-apa/judd-marmor-m-d/#:~:text=honorary%20Doctor%20of%20Humane%20Letters%20from%20Hebrew%20Union%20College%20in%20Los%20Angeles)

(https://archive.ph/uRDKA#selection-1877.418-1877.477:~:text=honorary%20Doctor%20of%20Humane%20Letters%20from%20Hebrew%20Union%20College)

(https://www.jinfo.org/Psychologists.html#:~:text=Hazel%20Markus%208-,Judd%20Marmor,-Abraham%20Maslow)

(https://archive.ph/k4k3#selection-1367.0-1367.11:~:text=Moses%20Maimonides-,Judd%20Marmor,-Abraham%20Maslow)

(https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/abs/10.1176/ajp.133.7.748)

Robert Spitzer (Jewish)

(https://www.timesofisrael.com/leading-jewish-american-psychiatrist-robert-spitzer-dies-at-83/)

(https://archive.ph/RS8Rh)

(https://www.haaretz.com/jewish/2015-12-27/ty-article/jewish-american-psychiatrist-robert-spitzer-dies/0000017f-f428-d887-a7ff-fcec40800000)

(https://archive.ph/JzCeP)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Robert_Spitzer_(psychiatrist)#:~:text=%5B4%5D-,He%20was%20born%20Jewish,-but%20held%20atheist)

(https://archive.ph/4o4ZB#selection-2969.1-2969.19:~:text=%5B4%5D-,He%20was%20born%20Jewish,-but%20held%20atheist)

Frank Kameny (Jewish)

(https://www.smithsonianmag.com/smithsonian-institution/frank-kameny-helped-chart-part-liberation-millions-gay-americans-180987148/#:~:text=Born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20May%2021%2C%201925%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family%2C%20Kameny)

(https://archive.ph/X7ymT#selection-553.0-553.65:~:text=Born%20in%20New%20York%20City%20on%20May%2021%2C%201925%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family%2C%20Kameny)

(https://www.queerportraits.com/bio/kameny#:~:text=He%20was%20born%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/XQ0YC#selection-789.80-789.110:~:text=He%20was%20born%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://forward.com/culture/311149/remembering-frank-kameny-the-jewish-moses-of-the-lgbt-movement/)

(https://archive.ph/J70Xg)

Barbara Gittings (Not Jewish)

John Fryer (Not Jewish)

3 Jews out of the 5 total people mentioned in the article as essential to the removal of Homosexuality from the DSM

60% Jewish

American Psychological Association Officers 1973

(https://www.psychiatry.org/getattachment/2bf5cb90-5421-4bd7-8c6c-0a60584b8f3f/am_program_1973.pdf)

Perry Talkington, President (Not Jewish)

Alfred Freedman, President-Elect (Jewish, father of Dan Freedman)

(https://momentmag.com/keepers-of-the-diagnostic-keys/?srsltid=AfmBOoqRZ1S1yizWYz2rwoSPjs0eihRXdt3shOdJJbYC0jMhBsTgJ_m-)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20251111201207/https://momentmag.com/keepers-of-the-diagnostic-keys/?srsltid=AfmBOoqRZ1S1yizWYz2rwoSPjs0eihRXdt3shOdJJbYC0jMhBsTgJ_m-#:~:text=Alfred%20M.%20Freedman%20(my%20father%3B%20more%20on%20him%20later)

(https://www.bnaiisraelcong.org/event/HazakMarch2024#:~:text=Dan%20grew%20up%20on%20Manhattan%E2%80%99s%C2%A0Upper%20West%20Side%20in%20a%20household%20that%20placed%20high%20value%20on%20Jewish%20jokes%2C%20humor%2C%20and%20Yiddishisms)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20240716060535/https://www.bnaiisraelcong.org/event/HazakMarch2024#:~:text=Dan%20grew%20up%20on%20Manhattan%E2%80%99s%C2%A0Upper%20West%20Side%20in%20a%20household%20that%20placed%20high%20value%20on%20Jewish%20jokes%2C%20humor%2C%20and%20Yiddishisms)

(https://momentmag.com/from-the-newsletter-exploring-jewish-community-in-far-flung-places/?srsltid=AfmBOopLDOE7BLHM25vtocnfmpC7ZAPMwR1ws1_ESSCyCyJtbOb40gKX)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20251111202403/https://momentmag.com/from-the-newsletter-exploring-jewish-community-in-far-flung-places/?srsltid=AfmBOopLDOE7BLHM25vtocnfmpC7ZAPMwR1ws1_ESSCyCyJtbOb40gKX)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedman#:~:text=were%20also%20adopted%20by%20Ashkenazi%20Jews%20(see%20Jewish%20surnames).%20It%20is%20the%209th%20most%20common%20surname%20in%20Israel%20(8th%20among%20Jews)%20and%20most%20common%20exclusively%20Ashkenazi%20name)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20250827121727/https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Friedman#:~:text=were%20also%20adopted%20by%20Ashkenazi%20Jews%20(see%20Jewish%20surnames).%20It%20is%20the%209th%20most%20common%20surname%20in%20Israel%20(8th%20among%20Jews)%20and%20most%20common%20exclusively%20Ashkenazi%20name)

Milton Greenblatt, Vice-President (Not Jewish)

Judd Marmor, Vice-President (Jewish)

(https://www.latimes.com/archives/la-xpm-2003-dec-20-me-marmor20-story.html#:~:text=Marmor%20was%20born%20in%201910%20in%20London%2C%20the%20son%20of%20a%20Yiddish%20scholar)

(https://archive.ph/SpD8y#selection-2759.0-2759.63:~:text=Marmor%20was%20born%20in%201910%20in%20London%2C%20the%20son%20of%20a%20Yiddish%20scholar)

(https://www.apaf.org/library-archives/president-s-of-the-apa/judd-marmor-m-d/#:~:text=honorary%20Doctor%20of%20Humane%20Letters%20from%20Hebrew%20Union%20College%20in%20Los%20Angeles)

(https://archive.ph/uRDKA#selection-1877.418-1877.477:~:text=honorary%20Doctor%20of%20Humane%20Letters%20from%20Hebrew%20Union%20College)

(https://www.jinfo.org/Psychologists.html#:~:text=Hazel%20Markus%208-,Judd%20Marmor,-Abraham%20Maslow)

(https://archive.ph/k4k3#selection-1367.0-1367.11:~:text=Moses%20Maimonides-,Judd%20Marmor,-Abraham%20Maslow)

(https://psychiatryonline.org/doi/abs/10.1176/ajp.133.7.748)

Robert Gibson, Secretary (Not Jewish)

Hayden Donahue, Treasurer (Not Jewish)

2 Jews out of 5 total

40% Jewish

Decriminalization of Homosexuality

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Decriminalization_of_homosexuality#History)

(https://archive.ph/vSRs7)

The French Revolution will be included in a future edition due to the fact that it will take a separate book to prove it's Jewishness, so instead of delaying the book until I finish making a whole other one for this one section, I will just release this as an initial edition and then add the essential part here.

Soviet Union

The Soviet Union was the second country to decriminalize Homosexuality following the October Revolution, in 1917.

I have already written an in-depth book dissecting the Jewishness of the Soviet Union titled Judeo-Bolshevism 1898-1922: The 'Red Star' of David, therefore I will only lay out here the final summary in the Final Average section:

Members of the Central Committee:

93.75 Jews

70.25 Non-Jews

164 Total

57.16% Jewish

Inner-composition of the Central Committee:

71.5 Jews

30.5 Non-Jews

102 Total

70.09% Jewish

Council of People’s Commissar:

26.5 Jews

43.5 Non-Jews

70 Total

37.85% Jewish

Ambassadors of the Soviet Union:

21 Jews

19 Non-Jews

40 Total

52.5% Jewish

Central Newspapers of the Soviet Union:

21.75 Jews

8.25 Non-Jews

30 Total

72.5% Jewish

October Revolution:

10.5 Jews

5 Non-Jews

16 Total

65.62% Jewish

Miscellaneous Organizations:

12 Jews

5 Non-Jews

16 Total

75% Jewish

Overall:

257 Jews

181.5 Non-Jews

438.5 Total

58.6% Jewish overall

All sources in my book: https://archive.org/details/judeo-bolshevism-1898-1922-the-red-star-of-david-2nd-edition

Legalization of Same-Sex Marriage

America

Miscellaneous Case Law

Baehr vs Miike
(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Baehr_v._Miike#:~:text=Judges%20sitting,(original%20Justices))

(https://archive.ph/JROJb#selection-1609.0-1629.20:~:text=Judges%20sitting,(original%20Justices)

Judges

James Burns (Not Jewish)

Walter Heen (Not Jewish)

Robert Klein (Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/List_of_Jewish_American_jurists#:~:text=Robert%20G.%20Klein%2C%20Associate%20Justice%20of%20the%20Supreme%20Court%20of%20Hawaii%20(1992%E2%80%932000)

(https://archive.ph/w27i6#selection-14227.0-14233.12:~:text=Robert%20G.%20Klein%2C%20Associate%20Justice%20of%20the%20Supreme%20Court%20of%20Hawaii%20(1992%E2%80%932000)

(https://jwiz.com/search/everywhere/Lawyers+Intellectual+Property#:~:text=Law%20Office%20of-,Robert%20G%20Klein,-Write%20a%20Review)

(https://archive.ph/XPNNr#selection-9045.0-9045.28:~:text=Law%20Office%20of%20Robert%20G%20Klein)

Steven Levinson (Jewish)

(https://archive.org/details/whoswhoinamerica0000unse_i8t7/page/456/mode/2up: Who's Who in American Law: 1998-1999 page 457)

(https://www.sdjewishworld.com/2018/10/25/of-hawaiian-judges-royalty-jews-and-torah/#:~:text=it%20was%20bar%20mitzvah%20day%20for%20Ezra%20Henry%20Levinson%2C%20whose%20distinguished%20family%C2%A0%20not%20only%20had%20helped%20to%20found%20this%20Reform%20congregation%20but%20counted%20within%20its%20ranks%20two%20former%20justices%20on%20the%20Hawaiian%20Supreme%20Court%2C%20Bernard%20Levinson%2C%20and%20his%20nephew%2C%20Steve%20Levinson)

(https://archive.ph/RuxjZ#selection-549.283-553.240:~:text=it%20was%20bar%20mitzvah%20day%20for%20Ezra%20Henry%20Levinson%2C%20whose%20distinguished%20family%C2%A0%20not%20only%20had%20helped%20to%20found%20this%20Reform%20congregation%20but%20counted%20within%20its%20ranks%20two%20former%20justices%20on%20the%20Hawaiian%20Supreme%20Court%2C%20Bernard%20Levinson%2C%20and%20his%20nephew%2C%20Steve%20Levinson)

Ronald Moon (Not Jewish)

United States v. Windsor

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/United_States_v._Windsor)

(https://archive.ph/AxjPe)

Plaintiff

Edith Windsor (Jewish)

(https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/windsor-edie)

(https://archive.ph/DKEgG)

(https://forward.com/opinion/552148/lgbtq-people-gained-civil-rights-10-years-ago-thanks-to-this-jewish-lesbian/)

(https://archive.ph/K5784)

(https://newvoices.org/2017/10/02/remembering-lgbt-activist-edie-windsor-a-woman-of-valor/)

(https://archive.ph/CpgbD)

Law Bill

Respect for Marriage Act (America)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Respect_for_Marriage_Act#First_House_vote:~:text=the%20House%20Judiciary%20Committee%20Chairman%20Jerrold%20Nadler%20(D%2DNY)%2C%20Senator%20Dianne%20Feinstein%20(D%2DCA)%2C%20Congressional%20LGBTQ%2B%20Equality%20Caucus%20Chairman%20David%20Cicilline%20(D%2DRI)%2C%20Senator%20Tammy%20Baldwin%20(D%2DWI)%20and%20Senator%20Susan%20Collins%20(R%2DME)%20announced%20the%20re%2Dintroduction%20of%20the%20Respect%20for%20Marriage%20Act)

(https://archive.ph/V0owl#selection-5301.14-5321.69:~:text=the%20House%20Judiciary%20Committee%20Chairman%20Jerrold%20Nadler%20(D%2DNY)%2C%20Senator%20Dianne%20Feinstein%20(D%2DCA)%2C%20Congressional%20LGBTQ%2B%20Equality%20Caucus%20Chairman%20David%20Cicilline%20(D%2DRI)%2C%20Senator%20Tammy%20Baldwin%20(D%2DWI)%20and%20Senator%20Susan%20Collins%20(R%2DME)%20announced%20the%20re%2Dintroduction%20of%20the%20Respect%20for%20Marriage%20Act)

Sponsors

Jerry Nadler (Jewish)

(https://jewishjournal.org/2025/09/11/youll-miss-jerry-nadler-when-hes-gone/#:~:text=the%20longest%2Dserving%20Jew)

(https://archive.ph/pzTTf#selection-1277.49-1277.72:~:text=the%20longest%2Dserving%20Jew)

(https://forward.com/news/765844/jerry-nadler-reelection-jewish-congress-mamdani/#:~:text=Nadler%2C%20a%20former%20Yeshiva%20student%2C%20has%20long%20been%20a%20pillar%20of%20Jewish%20representation%20in%20Congress)

(https://archive.ph/rLWfa#selection-735.0-735.93:~:text=Nadler%2C%20a%20former%20Yeshiva%20student%2C%20has%20long%20been%20a%20pillar%20of%20Jewish%20representation%20in%20Congress)

(https://www.nytimes.com/2025/09/01/nyregion/jerrold-nadler-congress-retires.html)

(https://archive.ph/mkAPP#selection-691.0-691.85:~:text=Mr.%20Nadler%2C%20who%20is%20both%20the%20longest%2Dserving%20New%20Yorker%20and%20Jewish%20member%20of%20the%20House)

Dianne Feinstein (Jewish)

(https://jwa.org/encyclopedia/article/feinstein-dianne)

(https://archive.ph/hN48x)

(https://forward.com/opinion/562526/dianne-feinstein-tenacious-american-jews/)

(https://archive.ph/gYtep)

(https://jweekly.com/2023/10/02/feinsteins-jewish-story-was-part-of-her-political-legacy/)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20250215063356/https://jweekly.com/2023/10/02/feinsteins-jewish-story-was-part-of-her-political-legacy/)

Tammy Baldwin (Jewish)

(https://www.ebar.com/news/article.php?sec=news&article=1923)

(https://archive.ph/4Axc#selection-549.52-549.82:~:text=my%20American%20Jewish%20grandfather)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Tammy_Baldwin#:~:text=Her%20maternal%20grandfather%2C%20biochemist%20David%20E.%20Green%2C%20was%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/9TzOa#selection-3479.1-3485.6:~:text=Her%20maternal%20grandfather%2C%20biochemist%20David%20E.%20Green%2C%20was%20Jewish)

(https://www.jewishchronicle.org/2012/10/29/senate-candidates-extol-bipartisanship-support-for-israel/?mo=12&yr=2025#:~:text=Baldwin%20said%20she%20first%20visited%20Israel%20as%20a%20child.%20She%20was%20raised%20by%20her%20maternal%20grandparents%3B%20and%20her%20Jewish%20grandfather)

(https://archive.ph/ToBaU#selection-989.9-989.130:~:text=Baldwin%20said%20she%20first%20visited%20Israel%20as%20a%20child.%20She%20was%20raised%20by%20her%20maternal%20grandparents%3B%20and%20her%20Jewish%20grandfather)

David Cicilline (Jewish)

(https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/david-cicilline)

(https://archive.ph/AaazX)

(https://www.timesofisrael.com/david-cicilline-the-jewish-lawmaker-leading-trump-impeachment-charge/)

(https://archive.ph/PBYBM)

(https://www.jta.org/2022/09/29/politics/david-cicilline-jewish-progressive-is-new-chair-of-house-middle-east-subcommittee)

(https://archive.ph/fOZGK)

Susan Collins (Not Jewish)

Canada

Miscellaneous Case Law

M. v H.

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/M._v._H.#:~:text=On%20May%2019,the%20Supreme%20Court)

(https://archive.ph/FLshG#selection-2307.0-2343.56:~:text=On%20May%2019,the%20Supreme%20Court)

Trial Judge

Gloria Epstein (Jewish, grandmother of Benjamin Eric Stulberg Adair)

(https://holyblossomarchives.org/wp-content/uploads/2022/03/January-2012-Bulletin.pdf: Holy Blossom Temple Bulletin January 2012 page 15)

(http://www.outremont-high.com/OutremontHigh/Personal3/Entries/2007/4/20_Seymour_Epstein.html)

(https://archive.ph/mBa3H)

(https://smith.queensu.ca/about/advisory_board/Justice_Gloria_Epstein.php#:~:text=National%20secretary%20and%20member%20of%20the%20Canadian%20Council%20of%20Christians%20and%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/hO4Sd#selection-59.0-59.76:~:text=National%20secretary%20and%20member%20of%20the%20Canadian%20Council%20of%20Christians%20and%20Jews)

(https://www.sinaihealth.ca/foundation/about/board/gloria-epstein-f)

(https://archive.ph/sDmUW)

(https://www.sinaihealth.ca/foundation/our-stories/supporting-diversity-and-inclusion-with-global-impact#:~:text=To%20many%20members%20of%20the%20public%2C%20Sinai%20Health%20is%20an%20organization%20primarily%20aligned%20with%20the%20Jewish%20community)

(https://archive.ph/ZR3tv#selection-1951.73-1951.180:~:text=To%20many%20members%20of%20the%20public%2C%20Sinai%20Health%20is%20an%20organization%20primarily%20aligned%20with%20the%20Jewish%20community)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Epstein)

(https://archive.ph/M0J8q)

Law Bill

Civil Marriage Act

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Civil_Marriage_Act#:~:text=Introduced%20by,Minister%20of%20Justice)

(https://archive.ph/f9iiv#selection-231.0-235.33:~:text=Introduced%20by,Minister%20of%20Justice)

Introducer

Irwin Cotler (Jewish)

(https://cotler.tau.ac.il/irwin-cotler-bio/#:~:text=Born%20in%201940%20in%20Montreal%20to%20a%20Canadian%2DJewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/ePxTW#selection-395.0-395.52:~:text=Born%20in%201940%20in%20Montreal%20to%20a%20Canadian%2DJewish%20family)

(https://www.bbc.com/news/articles/cd7nj0gw2y1o#:~:text=Mr%20Cotler%2C%20who%20is%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/7ebKJ#selection-735.0-735.24:~:text=Mr%20Cotler%2C%20who%20is%20Jewish)

(https://www.timesofisrael.com/irwin-cotler-sounds-alarm-on-erosion-of-israels-greatest-protection-its-democracy/#:~:text=Cotler%20speaks%20Hebrew%20with%20his%20Israeli%20wife%2C%20Ariela%2C%20and%20divides%20his%20time%20between%20Canada%20and%20Israel%2C%20where%20several%20of%20his%20children%20and%20grandchildren%20live)

(https://archive.ph/wAr2e#selection-1001.206-1001.358:~:text=Cotler%20speaks%20Hebrew%20with%20his%20Israeli%20wife%2C%20Ariela%2C%20and%20divides%20his%20time%20between%20Canada%20and%20Israel%2C%20where%20several%20of%20his%20children%20and%20grandchildren%20live)

Miscellaneous Modern LGBTQ Organizations

Drag Queen Story Time

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Drag_Queen_Story_Hour#:~:text=Drag%20Queen%20Story%20Hour%20(DQSH)%2C%20Drag%20Queen%20Storytime%2C%20Drag%20Story%20Time%2C%20and%20Drag%20Story%20Hour%20are%20children%27s%20events%20first%20started%20in%202015%20by%20author%20and%20activist%20Michelle%20Tea)

(https://archive.ph/ZXKX4#selection-2005.0-2025.12:~:text=Drag%20Queen%20Story%20Hour%20(DQSH)%2C%20Drag%20Queen%20Storytime%2C%20Drag%20Story%20Time%2C%20and%20Drag%20Story%20Hour%20are%20children%27s%20events%20first%20started%20in%202015%20by%20author%20and%20activist%20Michelle%20Tea)

Founder

Michelle Tea – Tomasik (Jewish)

(https://atticbooks.co.ke/books/author/michelle-tea?srsltid=AfmBOopWl1NDceDovWWswYwaZbp4Y3ulXvfCfvenA8CH5bjWNbEQUMBb#:~:text=Her%20father%20was%20a%20Polish%20Jew)

(https://archive.ph/HKzBn#selection-727.65-727.92:~:text=Her%20father%20was%20a%20Polish%20Jew)

(https://famouswritingroutines.com/interviews/interview-with-michelle-tea/#:~:text=A%20Tzedakah%20bank%20filled%20with%20pennies%20which%20belongs%20to%20my%20son%3B%20it%E2%80%99s%20a%20Jewish%20generosity%20practice%20we%20began%20when%20he%20was%20really%20little)

(https://archive.ph/INeB4#selection-931.0-931.129:~:text=A%20Tzedakah%20bank%20filled%20with%20pennies%20which%20belongs%20to%20my%20son%3B%20it%E2%80%99s%20a%20Jewish%20generosity%20practice%20we%20began%20when%20he%20was%20really%20little)

Advocates for Trans Equality

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Advocates_for_Trans_Equality#Prominent_staff:~:text=%5B19%5D-,Prominent%20staff,-%5Bedit%5D)

(https://archive.ph/slKFG#selection-2603.0-2623.1:~:text=Prominent%20staff%E2%80%8B%5Bedit%5D)

Founder

Mara Keisling (Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mara_Keisling#:~:text=Keisling%20was%20born%20to%20William,siblings%20in%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/ZcpKB#selection-1655.0-1659.45:~:text=Keisling%20was%20born%20to%20William%20and%20Elaine%20Keisling%20in%20Scranton%2C%20Pennsylvania%2C%20as%20one%20of%20seven%20siblings%20in%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://jewishpublicaffairs.org/press-release/jcpa2018-annual-conference-calls-for-strengthened-jewish-community-engagement-to-build-a-strong-democratic-america-and-israel/#:~:text=%E2%80%9CTrans%20Rights%20is%20a%20Jewish%20Issue%3B%20Why%20Antisemitism%20is%20a%20Trans%20Issue%E2%80%9D%C2%A0with%20Mara%20Keisling%20(National%20Center%20for%20Transgender%20Equality)

(https://archive.ph/jFX2G#selection-571.0-573.61:~:text=%E2%80%9CTrans%20Rights%20is%20a%20Jewish%20Issue%3B%20Why%20Antisemitism%20is%20a%20Trans%20Issue%E2%80%9D%C2%A0with%20Mara%20Keisling%20(National%20Center%20for%20Transgender%20Equality)

Executive Director

Rodrigo Lehtinen (1/4 Jewish, daughter of Ileana Ros-Lehtinen)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Rodrigo_Lehtinen#:~:text=He%20is%20of%20Turkish%2DJewish%20and%20Cuban%2DJewish%20descent%20through%20his%20mother%20and%20of%20Finnish%20descent%20through%20his%20father)

(https://archive.ph/hPuBB#selection-2011.1-2023.27:~:text=He%20is%20of%20Turkish%2DJewish%20and%20Cuban%2DJewish%20descent%20through%20his%20mother%20and%20of%20Finnish%20descent%20through%20his%20father)

(https://www.jpost.com/israel-news/israel-honors-congresswomen-ros-lehtinen-as-a-defender-of-israel-570078#:~:text=Ros%2DLehtinen%2C%2066%2C%20raised%20Roman%20Catholic%2C%20is%20the%20granddaughter%20of%20Turkish%20Jews%20who%20had%20immigrated%20to%20Cuba)

(https://archive.ph/l90hs#selection-715.0-715.77:~:text=Ros%2DLehtinen%2C%2066%2C%20raised%20Roman%20Catholic%2C%20is%20the%20granddaughter%20of%20Turkish%20Jews)

(https://www.ku.fi/artikkeli/2765748-ileana-ros-lehtinen-miamin-rautarouva#:~:text=Ileana%27s%20mother%2C%20Amanda%20Adato%20%2C%20who%20died%20last%20year%2C%20was%20the%20child%20of%20Jewish%20immigrants%20who%20moved%20to%20Cuba%20from%20Turkey)

(https://archive.ph/uU05h#selection-921.0-935.57:~:text=Ileana%27s%20mother%2C%20Amanda%20Adato%20%2C%20who%20died%20last%20year%2C%20was%20the%20child%20of%20Jewish%20immigrants)

Former Director of External Relations and Policy Advisor

Raffi Freedman-Gurspan (Jewish)

(https://www.bringyourownchair.org/artists/?target=174#:~:text=Freedman%2DGurspan%20was%20adopted%20from%20Honduras%20by%20Jewish%20parents%20and%20grew%20up%20in%20Brookline%2C%20Massachusetts.%20She%20self%2Didentifies%20as%20an%20indigenous%20Central%20American%2C%20a%20Latina%2C%20and%20as%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/xKnng#selection-4437.0-4437.180:~:text=Freedman%2DGurspan%20was%20adopted%20from%20Honduras%20by%20Jewish%20parents%20and%20grew%20up%20in%20Brookline%2C%20Massachusetts.%20She%20self%2Didentifies%20as%20an%20indigenous%20Central%20American%2C%20a%20Latina%2C%20and%20as%20Jewish)

(https://www.latinoobservatory.org/noticia.php?lang=en&ID=552#:~:text=she%20was%20adopted,and%20as%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/m02bY#selection-533.219-543.231:~:text=she%20was%20adopted,and%20as%20Jewish)

(https://forward.com/news/335862/jewish-transgender-woman-named-white-house-lgbt-liaison/#:~:text=Raffi%20Freedman%2DGurspan%2C%20who%20is%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/YqmNj#selection-713.0-713.37:~:text=Raffi%20Freedman%2DGurspan%2C%20who%20is%20Jewish)

Massachusetts Transgender Political Coalition

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Massachusetts_Transgender_Political_Coalition#:~:text=Mason%20J.%20Dunn%20is%20the%20former%20executive%20director%20of%20the%20organization)

(https://archive.ph/ih7oP#selection-1549.0-1555.18:~:text=Key%20people,Dunn%2C%20executive%20director)

Former Executive Director

Mason Dunn (Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Mason_J._Dunn#:~:text=Dunn%20is%20a%20nonbinary%2C%20trans%20masculine%2C%20and%20bisexual/queer%20identifying%20Jewish%20person)

(https://archive.ph/2cZmr#selection-1451.203-1471.7:~:text=Dunn%20is%20a%20nonbinary%2C%20trans%20masculine%2C%20and%20bisexual/queer%20identifying%20Jewish%20person)

(https://www.masslive.com/news/2024/02/lgbtq-leaders-political-activist-mason-dunn-is-inspired-by-empathy.html#:~:text=Dunn%20identifies%20as%20a%20non%2Dbinary%2C%20trans%20masculine%20and%20bisexual/queer%20identifying%20Jewish%20person)

(https://archive.ph/3hpQe#selection-491.118-491.241:~:text=Dunn%20identifies%20as%20a%20non%2Dbinary%2C%20trans%20masculine%20and%20bisexual/queer%20identifying%20Jewish%20person%20who%20uses%20he%20and%20they%20pronouns)

(https://www.wbur.org/inside/staff/mason-dunn#:~:text=Mason%20Dunn%20(he/him%20or%20they/them)%20is%20a%20transgender%20rights%20advocate%20and%20activist%20and%20the%20director%20of%20advocacy%20for%20Keshet%2C%20a%20nonprofit%20working%20for%20LGBTQ%20equality%20in%20Jewish%20life)

(https://archive.ph/WytqZ#selection-647.0-649.163:~:text=Mason%20Dunn%20(he/him%20or%20they/them)%20is%20a%20transgender%20rights%20advocate%20and%20activist%20and%20the%20director%20of%20advocacy%20for%20Keshet%2C%20a%20nonprofit%20working%20for%20LGBTQ%20equality%20in%20Jewish%20life)

(https://www.masslive.com/news/2024/02/these-are-the-lgbtq-leaders-of-mass-chosen-by-masslive-readers.html)

(https://archive.ph/oBCpb#selection-4475.118-4475.211:~:text=Dunn%20identifies%20as%20a%20non%2Dbinary%2C%20trans%20masculine%20and%20bisexual/queer%20identifying%20Jewish%20person)

Trans Student Educational Resources

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Trans_Student_Educational_Resources#:~:text=Founder,Eli%20Erlick)

(https://archive.ph/PxhKz#selection-1075.0-1081.10:~:text=Founder,Eli%20Erlick)

Founder

Eli Erick (Jewish)

(https://www.yahoo.com/lifestyle/trans-woman-shares-gender-expression-journey-femme-dapper-213502019.html?guccounter=1&guce_referrer=aHR0cHM6Ly9lbi53aWtpcGVkaWEub3JnLw&guce_referrer_sig=AQAAAGFhuCZ8p2UUNKbU_mRmVTW0I6cPcp5CyoophyDHy0Np0674EqlRevhaAIqaOP-7ylxaFZPOueZISJH2fLovlD-QmR-aUjilhWHWxAtF8jwfltuVPRLx132IcMG60c7wfecCznYcUZ4w6uB1dGgUkdjfus0OKMQDEqM6hUh_Q7Rz#:~:text=I%20spent%20years%20growing%20up%20as%20this%20queer%2C%20Jewish%20trans%20girl%20in%20a%20rural%20community)

(https://archive.ph/8dpKA#selection-767.104-767.161:~:text=I%20spent%20years%20growing%20up%20as%20this%20queer%2C%20Jewish%20trans%20girl)

(https://elierlick.com/palestine/#:~:text=My%20name%20is%20Eli.%20I%E2%80%99m%20a%20Jewish%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/UfncG#selection-741.0-741.44:~:text=Hello!%20My%20name%20is%20Eli.%20I%E2%80%99m%20a%20Jewish%20activist)

(https://www.instagram.com/p/CywRII9OMs5/?hl=en)

(https://archive.ph/MWJ7P)

Sylvia Rivera Law Project

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Sylvia_Rivera_Law_Project#:~:text=The%20organization%20was%20formed%20in%20August%202002%20by%20attorney%20and%20transgender%20civil%20rights%20activist%20Dean%20Spade)

(https://archive.ph/NcC6n#selection-1571.32-1573.10:~:text=The%20organization%20was%20formed%20in%20August%202002%20by%20attorney%20and%20transgender%20civil%20rights%20activist%2C%20Dean%20Spade)

Founder

Dean Spade (Jewish)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Dean_Spade#:~:text=%5Bedit%5D-,Spade%20is%20Jewish,-%2C%5B30)

(https://archive.ph/TfTAk#selection-2267.0-2267.15:~:text=%5Bedit%5D-,Spade%20is%20Jewish,-%2C%5B30)

(https://www.deanspade.net/2016/01/15/creating-change-pinkwashing-ice-pinkwashing-israel/#:~:text=As%20a%20Jewish%20trans%20activist)

(https://archive.ph/x8eSv#selection-1589.1320-1589.1346:~:text=As%20a%20Jewish%20trans%20activist)

(https://www.treyfpodcast.com/2017/06/29/31-dean-spade/#:~:text=Dean%20Spade%20(trans%20activist%2C%20professor%20and%20author)%20about%20growing%20up%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/oHZbR#selection-555.0-555.87:~:text=We%20spoke%20with%20Dean%20Spade%20(trans%20activist%2C%20professor%20and%20author)%20about%20growing%20up%20Jewish)

Truth Wins Out

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Truth_Wins_Out#:~:text=19%20years%20ago-,Founder,Wayne%20Besen,-Focus)

(https://archive.ph/fsKPz#selection-205.0-211.11:~:text=14%C2%A0years%20ago-,Founder,Wayne%20Besen,-Focus)

Founder

Wayne Bensen (Jewish)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20190313013511/http://www.epgn.com/news/14288-truth-wins-out-founder-fighting-google-ex-gays-in-philly#:~:text=because%20as%20a%20non%2Dreligious%20Jewish%20family)

(https://www.jewage.org/wiki/ru/Article:Wayne_Besen_-_Biography)

(https://archive.ph/JBnUk)

(https://www.jpost.com/opinion/columnists/fabulously-observant-if-not-ex-gay-then-what#:~:text=Jewish%20writer%20Wayne%20Besen%27s)

(https://archive.ph/kpgmX#selection-733.1955-733.1980:~:text=Jewish%20writer%20Wayne%20Besen%27s)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Wayne_Besen#:~:text=Born%20into%20a%20non%2Dreligious%2C%20liberal%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/cADfM#selection-1695.0-1695.48:~:text=Born%20into%20a%20non%2Dreligious%2C%20liberal%20Jewish%20family)

Indivisible

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Indivisible_movement#:~:text=Indivisible%27s%20founders%2C%20Leah%20Greenberg%20and%20Ezra%20Levin)

(https://archive.ph/QvZvx#selection-1675.0-1681.10:~:text=Indivisible%27s%20founders%2C%20Leah%20Greenberg%20and%20Ezra%20Levin)

Founders

Leah Greenberg (Jewish) and Ezra Levin (Jewish)

(https://www.timesofisrael.com/meet-the-jewish-couple-leading-the-trump-resistance/)

(https://archive.ph/27dHb)

(https://www.jta.org/2017/02/23/politics/meet-the-jewish-couple-leading-the-trump-resistance)

(https://archive.ph/2V2UC)

(https://www.jewishpressgulfcoast.com/articles/all-the-jews-who-made-the-time-100-most-influential-people-list/#:~:text=Leah%20Greenberg%20and%20Ezra%20Levin%2C%20who%20started%20the%20progressive%20activism%20group%20Indivisible)

(https://archive.ph/GiN3F)

Parents, Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/PFLAG#:~:text=The%20organization%20was%20founded%20by%20Jeanne%20Manford%20and%20her%20husband)

(https://archive.ph/qxvcQ#selection-1999.0-2003.16:~:text=The%20organization%20was%20founded%20by%20Jeanne%20Manford%20and%20her%20husband)

Founders

Jeanne Manford – Sobelson (Jewish)

(https://www.myjewishlearning.com/2015/06/08/jeanne-manford-the-jewish-woman-who-advocated-for-her-gay-son/)

(https://archive.ph/vutFM)

(https://www.newyorker.com/magazine/2023/04/17/how-one-mothers-love-for-her-gay-son-started-a-revolution)

(https://archive.ph/RU9XM#selection-723.595-723.618:~:text=Manford%2C%20a%20New%20York%20Jew)

(https://jwa.org/weremember/manford-jeanne)

(https://archive.ph/vPL5E)

Jules Manford (Jewish partner Jeanne Manford – Sobelson)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Jeanne_Manford#Later_life:~:text=She%20married%20Jules%20Manford)

(https://archive.ph/vAVY8#selection-1507.70-1507.95:~:text=She%20married%20Jules%20Manford)

(https://www.mounthebroncemetery.com/legacy/stories/view/?id=94#:~:text=Jeanne%20married%20Jules%20Manford)

(https://archive.ph/0rzrX#selection-667.228-667.256:~:text=Jeanne%20married%20Jules%20Manford)

(https://www.latimes.com/local/obituaries/la-xpm-2013-jan-10-la-me-jeanne-manford-20130110-story.html#:~:text=she%20and%20her%20husband%20Jules%20founded%20a%20local%20support%20group%20for%20parents%20of%20gays%20and%20lesbians)

(https://archive.ph/ryLJZ#selection-2701.64-2701.152:~:text=she%20and%20her%20husband%20Jules%20founded%20a%20local%20support%20group%20for%20parents%20of%20gays%20and%20lesbians)

interACT

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/InterACT#:~:text=Founder,Anne%20Tamar%2DMattis)

(https://archive.ph/YvPlp#selection-1667.0-1673.17:~:text=Founder,Anne%20Tamar%2DMattis)

Founder

Anne Tamar-Mattis (Converted Jewish and Jewish spouse Suegee Tamar-Mattis)

(https://www.nershalom.org/event-calendar/shabbat-2022-july-1#:~:text=Anne%20Tamar%2DMattis%20as%20she%20completes%20her%20conversion%20to%20Judaism)

(https://archive.ph/fWG0H#selection-1037.0-1037.125:~:text=On%20this%20Shabbat%2C%20we%20are%20delighted%20to%20celebrate%20Ner%20Shalom%20member%20Anne%20Tamar%2DMattis%20as%20she%20completes%20her%20conversion%20to%20Judaism)

(https://theoutwordsarchive.org/interview/anne-and-suegee-tamar-mattis/#:~:text=Their%20father%20came%20from%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20Russian%20background)

(https://archive.ph/QjmBl#selection-17915.128-17915.188:~:text=Their%20father%20came%20from%20an%20Orthodox%20Jewish%20Russian%20background)

Think Again

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Think_Again#:~:text=founded%20in%201997%20by%20David%20John%20Attyah%20(b.%20Los%20Angeles%2C%20CA)%20and%20S.%20A.%20Bachman)

(https://archive.ph/X9zkR#selection-1795.37-1797.13:~:text=founded%20in%201997%20by%20David%20John%20Attyah%20(b.%20Los%20Angeles%2C%20CA)%20and%20S.%20A.%20Bachman)

Founders

S. A. Bachman (Jewish)

(https://truthout.org/articles/homeland-insecurity-jews-and-muslims-united-against-domestic-violence-and-sexual-assault/#:~:text=S.A.%20Bachman%2C%20a%2060%2Dyear%2Dold%20Jewish%20educator%20and%20agitator)

(https://archive.ph/qWEfo#selection-1167.19-1167.75:~:text=S.A.%20Bachman%2C%20a%2060%2Dyear%2Dold%20Jewish%20educator%20and%20agitator)

(https://www.familysearch.org/en/surname?surname=BACHMAN#:~:text=Bachman%20Name%20Meaning-,Jewish%20(Ashkenazic),-%3A%20artificial%20name)

(https://archive.ph/JQ2fv)

David Attyah (Not Jewish)

Transgender Europe

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Transgender_Europe#:~:text=Executive%20Director,Ymania%20Brown)

(https://archive.ph/X5ETD#selection-1811.0-1815.12:~:text=Executive%20Director,Ymania%20Brown)

Executive Director

Ymania Brown (Jewish)

(https://gin-ssogie.org/remembering-tuisina-ymania-brown/#:~:text=Ymania%E2%80%99s%20faith%20(Christian%2C%20Jewish%20and%20Buddhist)

(https://archive.ph/9gcWU#selection-2797.314-2797.361:~:text=Ymania%E2%80%99s%20faith%20(Christian%2C%20Jewish%20and%20Buddhist)

(https://www.arcusfoundation.org/blog/story-of-impact/lgbtq-faith-leaders-meet-find-consensus-in-golden-rule/#:~:text=Tuisina%20Ymania%20Brown%2C%20born%20into%20Jewish%20and%20Catholic%20traditions%20and%20influenced%20by%20Buddhism)

(https://archive.ph/YwRLC#selection-1417.72-1417.153:~:text=Ymania%20Brown%2C%20born%20into%20Jewish%20and%20Catholic%20traditions%20and%20influenced%20by%20Buddhism)

(https://www.arcusfoundation.org/wp-content/uploads/2018/09/ARCUS_AR17_spreads_web.pdf: ARCUS Annual Report 2017 page 12)

GenderPAC

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/GenderPAC#:~:text=GenderPAC%20was%20founded%20in%201995%20by%20Riki%20Wilchins)

(https://archive.ph/rfIEf#selection-1631.0-1633.13:~:text=GenderPAC%20was%20founded%20in%201995%20by%20Riki%20Wilchins)

Founder

Riki Wilchins (Jewish)

(https://forward.com/life/360231/patriarchy-perfectionism-and-anti-semitism-influence-jewish-girls-self/#:~:text=she%20herself%20is%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/Mrrpz#selection-715.144-715.165:~:text=she%20herself%20is%20Jewish)

(https://www.myjewishlearning.com/2019/04/17/5-lgbtq-jewish-activists-to-know/#:~:text=on%20our%20blog.-,Riki%20Wilchins,-was%20born%20on)

(https://archive.ph/uQF1p)

(https://ejewishphilanthropy.com/one-rock-at-a-time-addressing-the-impact-of-feminine-norms-on-jewish-girls/#:~:text=American%20Jews.%20I%20had%20plenty%20of%20examples%20from%20within%20my%20own%20family%20%E2%80%93%20my%20brother%2C%20sister%2C%20and%20mother%20(not%20to%20mention%20myself)

(https://archive.ph/Sxac0)

Gender Justice League

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender_Justice_League#:~:text=Executive%20Director,Danni%20Askini)

(https://archive.ph/HQ0p3#selection-1697.0-1701.12:~:text=Executive%20Director,Danni%20Askini)

(https://www.genderjusticeleague.org/announcing-danni-coed-national-programs/#:~:text=As%20our%20founding%20Executive%20Director%2C%20Danni%20helped%20lead%20Gender%20Justice%20League)

(https://archive.ph/ZAfBQ#selection-801.162-801.237:~:text=As%20our%20founding%20Executive%20Director%2C%20Danni%20helped%20lead%20Gender%20Justice%20League)

Founding Executive Director

Danni Askini (Jewish)

(https://www.cascadepbs.org/equity/2018/05/surgery-leaves-trans-activist-danni-askini-voiceless-not-silent/#:~:text=Askini%2C%20who%20is%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/iGElM#selection-1179.0-1179.21:~:text=Askini%2C%20who%20is%20Jewish)

(https://x.com/search?q=from%3Adanniaskini%20jew&src=typed_query)

(https://archive.ph/JwS2y)

Gender Rights Maryland

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Gender_Rights_Maryland#:~:text=Dana%20Beyer%2C%20M,executive%20director)

(https://archive.ph/lJkYz#selection-1571.0-1579.18:~:text=Dana%20Beyer%2C%20M,executive%20director)

Executive Director

Dana Beyer (Jewish)

(https://cornellalumnimagazine.com/identity-politics/2/#:~:text=ayne%20Beyer%20mumbled%20the%20prayer%20every%20day%2C%20confused%20and%20alarmed.-,Growing%20up%20in%20Queens%2C%20Beyer%20was%20raised%20by%20Conservative%20Jewish%20parents,-who%20opted%20to%20send%20their%20oldest%20child%20to%20a%20yeshiva)

(https://archive.ph/3ySUN#selection-511.67-511.136:~:text=ayne%20Beyer%20mumbled%20the%20prayer%20every%20day%2C%20confused%20and%20alarmed.-,Growing%20up%20in%20Queens%2C%20Beyer%20was%20raised%20by%20Conservative%20Jewish%20parents,-who%20opted%20to%20send%20their%20oldest%20child%20to%20a%20yeshiva)

(https://justfacts.votesmart.org/candidate/biography/67268/dana-beyer#:~:text=Religion%3A,Jewish)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20251129115947/https://justfacts.votesmart.org/candidate/biography/67268/dana-beyer#:~:text=Religion%3A,Jewish)

(https://www.digitaltransgenderarchive.net/files/dn39x1845#:~:text=Fame%20in%202014.-,Beyer%20is%20Jewish,-and%20has%20also)

(https://archive.ph/wLped#selection-523.1155-523.1170:~:text=Fame%20in%202014.-,Beyer%20is%20Jewish,-and%20has%20also)

Freedom to Marry

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Freedom_to_Marry#:~:text=York%2C%20U.S.-,Founder,Evan%20Wolfson,-Website)

(https://archive.ph/5nupO#selection-131.0-137.12:~:text=York%2C%20U.S.-,Founder,Evan%20Wolfson,-Website)

Founder

Evan Wolfson (Jewish)

(https://www.sdjewishworld.com/2025/02/04/todays-jewish-birthday-evan-wolfson/)

(https://archive.ph/06j6N)

(https://ediblemanhattan.com/tastemakers/in-the-kitchen-with-evan-wolfson/#:~:text=True%20to%20our%20Jewish%20heritage)

(https://archive.ph/hMUhT#selection-5965.0-5969.26:~:text=True%20to%20our%20Jewish%20heritage)

(https://www.atlantajewishtimes.com/ajff-personal-fight-marriage-freedom/#:~:text=Jewish%20Harvard%20Law%20School%20student%20named%20Evan%20Wolfson)

(https://archive.ph/YpxWH#selection-683.15-683.67:~:text=Jewish%20Harvard%20Law%20School%20student%20named%20Evan%20Wolfson)

LGBTory

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Benjamin_Dichter#:~:text=He%20is%20the%20founder%20of%20the%20LGBTQ%20conservative%20group%20LGBTory)

(https://archive.ph/5Q3QG#selection-1581.3-1583.7:~:text=He%20is%20the%20founder%20of%20the%20LGBTQ%20conservative%20group%20LGBTory)

Founder

Benjamin Dichter (Jewish)

(https://thecjn.ca/podcasts/freedom-convoy-spokesman-benjamin-dichter-takes-us-behind-the-scenes-of-the-three-weeks-that-paralyzed-ottawa/#:~:text=Dichter%20wasn%E2%80%99t%20just%20the%20convoy%20spokesperson%E2%80%94he%E2%80%99s%20also%20their%20biggest%20Jewish%20face.%20In%20this%20extensive%20interview%20with%20The%20CJN%20Daily%2C%20Dichter%20explains%20his%20decision%20to%20reveal%20his%20Jewish%20identity%20publicly)

(https://archive.ph/Cv3JD#selection-1587.38-1591.70:~:text=Dichter%20wasn%E2%80%99t%20just%20the%20convoy%20spokesperson%E2%80%94he%E2%80%99s%20also%20their%20biggest%20Jewish%20face.%20In%20this%20extensive%20interview%20with%20The%20CJN%20Daily%2C%20Dichter%20explains%20his%20decision%20to%20reveal%20his%20Jewish%20identity%20publicly)

(https://www.tabletmag.com/sections/news/articles/the-freedom-convoy-renegade-jew-benjamin-dichter)

(https://archive.ph/2Saz4)

(https://x.com/BJdichter/status/1752037685961650494)

(https://archive.ph/7crVJ)

Miscellaneous Pro-LGBTQ Media

Television Channels

Logo TV

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Logo_TV#:~:text=Its%20first%20president%2C%20Brian%20Graden%2C%20was%20named%20by%20Out%20as%20the%2015th%20most%20powerful%20gay%20person%20in%20America%20in%202007)

(https://archive.ph/OQuxC#selection-2111.24-2121.56:~:text=Its%20first%20president%2C%20Brian%20Graden%2C%20was%20named%20by%20Out%20as%20the%2015th%20most%20powerful%20gay%20person%20in%20America%20in%202007)

First President

Brian Graden (Jewish)

(https://www.simpletoremember.com/articles/a/jews-in-the-media-hollywood/)

(https://archive.ph/Y5PZq#selection-481.0-481.44:~:text=BRIAN%20GRADEN%2C%20president%20of%20MTV%20entertainment)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Brian_Graden#:~:text=MTV%20executives-,Gay%20Jews,-This%20page%20was)

(https://archive.ph/LdHcE#selection-6015.0-6015.26:~:text=21st%2Dcentury%20American%20Jews)

(https://www.marketscreener.com/insider/BRIAN-GRADEN-A3GERK/network/#:~:text=Undergraduate%20Degree-,Jewish%20Home%20Lifecare,-%2C%20Sarah%20Neuman%20Center)

(https://archive.ph/w4sYZ#selection-11267.25-11267.46:~:text=Undergraduate%20Degree-,Jewish%20Home%20Lifecare%2C,-Sarah%20Neuman%20Center)

Former Executive Vice-President and General Manager

Lisa Sherman (Jewish)

(https://www.nytimes.com/2008/06/02/business/smallbusiness/02shift.html)

(https://archive.ph/CeMcF#selection-793.363-793.389:~:text=Ms.%20Sherman%2C%20who%20is%20Jewish)

(https://www.lisa-sherman.com/about#:~:text=Lisa%20has%20also%20created%20a%20production%20called%20%E2%80%9CDecades%20of%20Jewish%20Divas%E2%80%9D%20which%20offers%20an%20overview%20of%20Jewish%20female%20singer/songwriters%20from%20the%20%E2%80%9940s%20to%20the%20present%20day)

(https://archive.ph/ihTKt#selection-223.340-223.501:~:text=Lisa%20has%20also%20created%20a%20production%20called%20%E2%80%9CDecades%20of%20Jewish%20Divas%E2%80%9D%20which%20offers%20an%20overview%20of%20Jewish%20female%20singer/songwriters%20from%20the%20%E2%80%9940s%20to%20the%20present%20day)

(https://www.ancestry.com/last-name-meaning/sherman#:~:text=Ashkenazic)%20Schermann.-,Jewish%20(Ashkenazic),-%3A%20occupational%20name%20for)

(https://archive.ph/B4Huy#selection-407.0-407.19:~:text=Ashkenazic)%20Schermann.-,Jewish%20(Ashkenazic),-%3A%20occupational%20name%20for)

Here TV

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Here_TV#:~:text=Paul%20Colichman%20and%20Stephen%20Jarchow%20(founders)

(https://archive.ph/VLvak#selection-1587.0-1589.31:~:text=Paul%20Colichman%20and%20Stephen%20Jarchow%20(founders)

Founders

Paul Colichman (Jewish)

(https://www.lukeford.net/profiles/profiles/paul_colichman.htm#:~:text=My%20parents%20were%20atypically%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/eLbzJ#selection-161.143-161.176:~:text=My%20parents%20were%20atypically%20Jewish)

(https://www.jewishvirtuallibrary.org/entertainment-industry-leaders-protest-cultural-boycott-of-israel#:~:text=Paul%20Colichman%3A%C2%A0Chief%20Executive%20Officer%20at%20Here%20Media%2C%20Inc)

(https://archive.ph/QUr7p#selection-993.0-995.43:~:text=Paul%20Colichman%3A%C2%A0Chief%20Executive%20Officer%20at%20Here%20Media%2C%20Inc)

(https://forebears.io/surnames/colichman#:~:text=in%20the%20World-,Approximately%204%20people%20bear%20this%20surname,Israel,-Colichman%20Surname)

(https://archive.ph/vhwt6#selection-559.0-633.6:~:text=in%20the%20World-,Approximately%204%20people%20bear%20this%20surname,Israel,-Colichman%20Surname)

Stephen Jarchow (Not Jewish)

Pornography Companies

Lucas Entertainment

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Lucas_Entertainment#:~:text=founded%20by%20porn%20star%20Michael%20Lucas%20in%201998)

(https://archive.ph/sDNuO#selection-1871.1-1879.8:~:text=founded%20by%20porn%20star%20Michael%20Lucas%20in%201998)

Founder

Michael Lucas (Jewish)

(https://www.ynetnews.com/culture/article/bykdof3ya)

(https://archive.ph/C0ybx)

(https://www.jnf.org/menu-3/news-media/israelcast/michael-lucas#:~:text=very%20connected%20to%20his%20Jewish%20heritage)

(https://archive.ph/CHO7b#selection-1111.312-1111.349:~:text=very%20connected%20to%20his%20Jewish%20heritage)

(https://www.jpost.com/opinion/article-783743)

(https://archive.ph/ipfuB)

Nova Studios

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Nova_Studios#:~:text=established%20by%20Scott%20Masters%20in%201977)

(https://archive.ph/gtLPb#selection-1539.1-1543.8:~:text=established%20by%20Scott%20Masters%20in%201977)

Founder

Scott Masters (Jewish)

(https://www.famousfix.com/topic/scott-masters#:~:text=the%20following%20lists%3A-,LGBTQ%20Jews,-%2D%C2%A011%20lists%2C%20825)

(https://dic.academic.ru/book.nsf/58187507/Scott+Masters#:~:text=Scott%20Masters%20is%20a%20Jewish%20gay%20pornographic%20film%20director)

(https://archive.ph/vzri3#selection-1109.0-1109.56:~:text=Scott%20Masters%20is%20a%20Jewish%20gay%20pornographic%20film%20director)

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Scott_Masters#Death:~:text=gay%20pornographic%20films-,Gay%20Jews,-American%20LGBTQ%20film)

(https://archive.ph/F66ex#selection-3675.0-3675.8:~:text=gay%20pornographic%20films-,Gay%20Jews,-American%20LGBTQ%20film)

Shane's World

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Shane%27s_World#:~:text=The%20company%20was%20originally%20started%20by%20Seymore%20Butts%27%20ex%2Dgirlfriend%20Shane)

(https://archive.ph/UnbOV#selection-1611.32-1617.5:~:text=The%20company%20was%20originally%20started%20by%20Seymore%20Butts%27%20ex%2Dgirlfriend%20Shane)

Founder

Shane (Jewish spouse Seymore Butts – Adam Glasser)

(https://www.timesofisrael.com/7-of-the-most-famous-jews-in-porn/#:~:text=Seymore%20Butts%0AReal%20name%3A%20Adam%20Glasser%0AButts%20%E2%80%93%20or%20Glasser%2C%20take%20your%20pick%20%E2%80%93%20was%20born%20in%20the%20Bronx%20to%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://archive.ph/Gq1wN#selection-1145.0-1155.77:~:text=Seymore%20Butts%0AReal%20name%3A%20Adam%20Glasser%0AButts%20%E2%80%93%20or%20Glasser%2C%20take%20your%20pick%20%E2%80%93%20was%20born%20in%20the%20Bronx%20to%20Jewish%20parents)

(https://www.imdb.com/name/nm0788017/bio/?ref_=nm_ov_bio_sm#:~:text=She%20was%20previously%20married%20to%20Seymore%20Butts)

(https://archive.ph/5JKB1#selection-1751.44-1753.13:~:text=She%20was%20previously%20married%20to%20Seymore%20Butts)

(https://www.vice.com/da/article/chatting-about-jew-ishness-with-the-greatest-jewish-porn-stars-623/#:~:text=his%20tight%2Dknit%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/FDrRA#selection-919.59-919.87:~:text=his%20tight%2Dknit%20Jewish%20family)

(https://www.imdb.com/title/tt0354293/#:~:text=Adam%20Glasser%20is%20a%20Jewish%20porn%20film%20director)

(https://archive.ph/2zZ6Q#selection-2277.0-2277.43:~:text=Adam%20Glasser%20is%20a%20Jewish%20porn%20film%20director)

Miscellaneous Notable Pro-LGBTQ Individuals

George Weinberg (Jewish), coined the term “Homophobia”

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/George_Weinberg_(psychologist)#:~:text=He%20coined%20the%20term%20%22homophobia%22%20in%20the%201960s%2C%20it%20first%20appearing%20in%20the%20press%20in%201969)

(https://archive.ph/cd9N7#selection-183.105-187.1:~:text=He%20coined%20the%20term%20%22homophobia%22)

(https://www.findagrave.com/memorial/177665376/george-weinberg#:~:text=Born%20George%20Henry%20Weinberg%2C%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/FVOmT#selection-951.217-951.265:~:text=Born%20George%20Henry%20Weinberg%2C%20into%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(http://www.elisarolle.com/queerplaces/fghij/George%20Weinberg.html#:~:text=George%20Weinberg%20was%20born%20on%20May%2017%2C%201929%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

(https://archive.ph/vVo4T#selection-37.0-37.60:~:text=George%20Weinberg%20was%20born%20on%20May%2017%2C%201929%2C%20to%20a%20Jewish%20family)

Joel Simkhai (Jewish), founder of Grindr

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Joel_Simkhai#:~:text=%5B11%5D-,Business%20career,-%5Bedit%5D)

(https://archive.ph/3eWG6#selection-1511.0-1531.1:~:text=Business%20career%E2%80%8B%5Bedit%5D)

(https://www.haaretz.com/israel-news/culture/2016-06-28/ty-article/the-israeli-loins-behind-grindr/0000017f-db84-d856-a37f-ffc427c90000)

(https://archive.ph/xAWTf)

(https://jewishjournal.com/cover_story/161967/)

(https://archive.ph/z3iU6)

Karl Baer (Jewish), first transgender person to undergo sex reassignment surgery

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Karl_M._Baer#:~:text=first%20transgender%20person%20to%20undergo%20sex%20reassignment%20surgery)

(https://archive.ph/HoOBv#selection-1499.20-1501.24:~:text=he%20became%20the%20first%20transgender%20person%20to%20undergo%20sex%20reassignment%20surgery)

(https://blog.nli.org.il/en/karlmbaer/#:~:text=Karl%20was%20born%20a%20Jewish%20baby%20girl%20named%20Martha%2C%20and%20ended%20in%20the%20State%20of%20Israel%20in%201956)

(https://archive.ph/DFnqI#selection-479.133-479.220:~:text=Karl%20was%20born%20a%20Jewish%20baby%20girl%20named%20Martha%2C%20and%20ended%20in%20the%20State%20of%20Israel%20in%201956)

(https://www.makingqueerhistory.com/articles/2022/12/11/karl-m-baer#:~:text=Karl%20would%20begin%20working%20on%20the%20Council%20for%20Jewish%20Life%20in%20Berlin%20in%201911.%20He%20would%20go%20on%20to%20become%20an%20important%20man%20in%20Jewish%20society%20in%20Germany)

(https://archive.ph/SgDAq#selection-1187.277-1187.422:~:text=Karl%20would%20begin%20working%20on%20the%20Council%20for%20Jewish%20Life%20in%20Berlin%20in%201911.%20He%20would%20go%20on%20to%20become%20an%20important%20man%20in%20Jewish%20society%20in%20Germany)

Judaic Scriptures

Judaic Scriptures recognize more than 2 genders/sexes:

Torah Uncensored: Gender Identity in the Talmud

(https://www.sefaria.org/sheets/398511.9?lang=bi)

(https://archive.ph/HNA2m)

“Zachar: This term is derived from the word for a pointy sword and refers to a phallus. It is usually translated as ‘male’ in English.

Nekevah: This term is derived from the word for a crevice and probably refers to a vaginal opening. It is usually translated as ‘female’ in English.

Androgynous: A person who has both ‘male’ and ‘female’ sexual characteristics. In the Talmud, the androgynous is understood as someone who both has a penis as well as some female sex traits. 149 references in Mishna and Talmud (1st – 8th Centuries CE); 350 in classical midrash and Jewish law codes (2nd – 16th Centuries CE).

Tumtum: A person whose sexual characteristics are indeterminate or obscured. In the Talmud the tumtum has indeterminate genitals. 181 references in Mishna and Talmud; 335 in classical midrash and Jewish law codes.

Ay’lonit: A person who is identified as ‘female’ at birth but develops ‘male’ characteristics at puberty and is infertile. 80 references in Mishna and Talmud; 40 in classical midrash and Jewish law codes.

Saris: A person who is identified as ‘male’ at birth but develops ‘female’ characteristics at puberty or later. A saris is considered male, but has no penis or a very small penis. A saris can be ‘naturally’ a saris (saris hamah), or become one through human intervention (saris adam). This status is also known as a eunuch. 156 references in mishna and Talmud; 379 in classical midrash and Jewish law codes.”

A Created Being of Its Own: Toward a Jewish Liberation Theology for Men, Women and Everyone Else page 8

(https://www.transtorah.org/PDFs/How_I_Met_the_Tumtum.pdf)

“The tumtum appears 17 times in the Mishna; 23 times in the Tosefta; 119 times in the Babylonian Talmud; 22 times in the Jerusalem Talmud and hundreds of times in midrash, commentaries, and halacha. The androgynous appears 21 times in the Mishna; 19 times in the Tosefta; 109 times in the Babylonina Talmud and countless times in midrash and halacha.”

The Seven Genders In The Talmud: Judaism has recognized nonbinary persons for millennia.

(https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/the-eight-genders-in-the-talmud/)

(https://archive.ph/GOjgI)

“Six Sexes" & Gender Expression

(https://www.sefaria.org/sheets/196557.23?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en)

(https://archive.ph/WJlJw)

Created in the Image of the Transgender Divine

(https://www.sefaria.org/sheets/425178.7?lang=en)

(https://archive.ph/FSwhH)

What the Torah Teaches Us About Gender Fluidity and Transgender Justice

(https://rac.org/blog/what-torah-teaches-us-about-gender-fluidity-and-transgender-justice)

(https://archive.ph/11lj2)

Queer Jews Studying Talmud

(https://www.bjpa.org/content/upload/bjpa/dec0/dec07fonrobert.pdf)

Gender Expression in Israelite Culture

(https://edification.cjccf.org/gender-expression-in-israelite-culture/)

(https://archive.ph/TPiFj)

Hermaphrodite

Note: Depending on the version it can say Androgynous or Hermaphrodite, Sefaria sometimes uses both terms so I decided to make a category for both, and I included non-specific terms like “male and female” in both categories.

(1) “A guardian, an agent, a slave, a woman, **one of doubtful sex, or a hermaphrodite** bring the bikkurim, but do not recite, since they cannot say: ‘Which you, O Lord, have given to me’ (Deuteronomy 26:10).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Bikkurim.1.5?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Bikkurim 1:5)

(2) “’Male and female he created them’ is a reference to the phylactery of the head and the phylactery of the hand, which together make one whole.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Introduction.30.243?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Introduction 30:243)

(3) “Therefore it says: ‘See now that I, I am he, and Elohim is not with me’, of which it should take counsel, since it has no colleague and no partner, nor even number, for **there is a ‘one’ which connotes combination, such as male and female**, of whom it is written, ‘for I have called him one’ (Is. 51, 2);”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.15.171?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 15:171)

(4) “The words ‘and (ve-eth) the earth’ indicate **the union of male and female**, which were traced with individual letters, and the ‘life of the king’ which flowed from the heavens, the heavens pouring them forth to maintain the earth and all its denizens.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.30.305?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 30:305)

(5) “Further, the two words eth hashamaim (the heavens) signify **the fitting union of male and female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.35.343?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 35:343)

(6) “Similarly we can interpret the text ‘the heavens and the earth’ to mean that the higher Shekinah and the lower Shekinah **will be joined in the union of male and female**;”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.86.246?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 86:246)

(7) “**For where male and female are not found together, he is eliminated** and only daleth is left (hence in Deut. 22, 15, the word na’ar is used for “maiden” instead of na’arah, because she is not united with the male).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.86.261?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 86:261)

(8) “For we have learnt that when God sends souls into the world they are **formed into pairs of male and female, and thus united**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Lech_Lecha.32.348?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 32:348)

(9) “There are thus two grades, which are, however, really one with two aspects, **male and female, in fitting union.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Toldot.14.109?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Toldot 14:109)

(10) “AND THEY SAID TO HIM: in the word elau (to him) there are dots over the letters aleph, yod, and vau, which spell out the word ayo (where is he?). This is a reference to the Holy One who is above. Again, the word thus formed ayo is followed by the word ayeh (where?), which is a feminine form of the same, to emphasise **the bond of union between the male and the female, which is the secret of true faith.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayera.6.98?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayera 6:98)

(11) “AND GOD SAID, LET THE WATERS FLOW: The word flow (yikavvu) implies that they were to go in a line (kav) so as to take a straight path. For from the first mystic point the Whole issues in secret, until it reaches and is gathered in to the supernal Palace, and from there it issues in a straight line to the other grades, until it comes to that place which **collects the whole in a union of male and female**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.7.66?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 7:1)

(12) “All are obligated on the three pilgrim Festivals in the mitzva of appearance, i.e., to appear in the Temple as well as to sacrifice an offering, except for a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor; **and a tumtum, and a hermaphrodite**, and women, and slaves who are not emancipated; and the lame, and the blind, and the sick, and the old, and one who is unable to ascend to Jerusalem on his own legs.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Chagigah.1.1?lang=bi&lookup=Mishnah%20Chagigah&with=Lexicon&lang2=en: Mishnah, Chagigah 1:1)

(13, 14) “Up to this point the words ‘The Lord our God the Lord’ (Tetragrammaton Elohenu Tetragrammaton) represent three grades corresponding to this deep mystery of Bereshith bara Elohim. Bereshith represents the primordial mystery. Bara represents the mysterious source from which the whole expanded. Elohim represents the force which sustains all below. The words eth hashammaim indicate that **the two latter are on no account to be separated, and are male and female together.** The word eth consists of the letters aleph and tau, which include between them all the letters, as being the first and last of the alphabet. Afterwards he was added, so that all the letters should be attached to he, and this gave the name attah (Thou); hence we read ‘and Thou (ve-attah) keepest all of them alive’ (Neh. 9, 6). Eth again alludes to Adonai (Lord), who is so called. Hashammaim is Tetragrammaton in its higher signification. The next word, ve-eth, **indicates the firm union of male and female**;”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.2.10?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar Bereshit 2:10-13)

(15) “The hermaphrodite is in some ways like men, and in other ways like women. In other ways he is like men and women, and in others he is like neither men nor women.”
(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Bikkurim.4.1?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Mishna Bikkurim 4:1)

(16) “An androgynous (i.e., a hermaphrodite) is in some ways like a man and in some ways like a woman. And in some ways he is like both a man and a woman, and in some ways he is like neither a man nor a woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Tosefta_Bikkurim.2.3?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Tosefta Bikkurim 2:2)

(17, 18) “The two supernal letters which rise aloft are intertwined the one within the other, expressing the union of mercy and severity. Hence they are two, and are of the upper world, symbolising the male principle. On the other hand, the one that ascended from below and joined them symbolises the female principle, and thus is embraced by the two, in the same way as the female is embraced by two arms, the right and the left, so that **a unity is formed which is both male and female**. For when the world was created it was the supernal letters that brought into being all the works of the lower world, literally after their own pattern. Hence, whoever has a knowledge of them and is observant of them is beloved both on high and below. R. Simeon said: ‘All these letters consist of **male and female merging together into one union**, symbolical of the upper waters and the lower waters, which also form one union. This is the type of perfect unity’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayetzei.26.260?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayetzei 26:260-261)

(19) “Rabbi Yose says: the hermaphrodite is a unique creature, and the sages could not decide about him. But this is not so with a tumtum (one of doubtful), for sometimes he is a man and sometimes he is a woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Bikkurim.4.5?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Mishna Bikkurim 4:5)

(20) “There are twelve involving the reproductive organs:
a-d) one whose member is crushed, mashed, severed, or cut off;
e-h) one whose testicles—or testicle—is crushed, mashed, severed, or cut off;
i) one who has only one testicle even though he has two sacs;
j) one whose two testicles are in one sac;
k) a person whose sexual organ is covered by flesh and his gender cannot be determined;
j) a hermaphrodite.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Admission_into_the_Sanctuary.7.8?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Mishneh Torah, Admission into the Sanctuary 7:8)

(21, 22, 23) “If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: **If a priest who is a hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yehuda says: **If a tumtum, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch**. A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman but he may not be married by a man, as he is considered a man. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had had relations with a male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Yevamot.8.6?lang=en: Mishnah, Yevamot 8:6)

(24) “He said: ‘The aleph of the word vayikra (and he called) is written small in the scroll, to show that this calling was not a perfect one, because it was only in the Tabernacle and in a strange land, perfection being only found in the Holy Land. Further, in the Tabernacle there was only the Shekinah, but in the land there was **the complete union of Male and Female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayechi.62.611?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayechi 62:611-612)

(25) “Observe that it has been said before that the desire of the male towards the female forms a soul, and the desire of **the female towards the male rises upwards to unite with the soul and form one being**. The woman is thus the body which is destined for the association of the soul that is derived from the male. These bodies, then, are destined to rise first, as we said already, and then all the others in the other lands will be raised in a complete state and will be renewed with the renewal of the moon, and the world will be restored to its primeval state, in allusion to which it is written: ‘Let the Lord rejoice in his works’ (Ps. 104, 31).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayeshev.5.62?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayeshev 5:62-63)

(26) “Observe that the function of the priests and Levites is to unite the Left with the Right. Said R. Hizkiah: That is so, but I have been told that one rouses the Left and the other the Right, because **the union of male and female** is only brought about by Left and Right, as it says: ‘O that his left hand were under my head, and his right hand should embrace me’ (S. S. 2, 6). Then male and female are united, and there is mutual desire and worlds are blessed and upper and lower rejoice.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayechi.69.718?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayechi 69:718)

(27) “Said R. Judah: It is written: ‘This thy stature is like to a palm tree’ (S.S. 7, 8)..What love, indeed, has the Holy One bestowed upon the Community of Israel in that He never separates Himself from her, but is perpetually and perfectly united with her, even as a palm tree in which **male and female are one in complete and continual union!**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Mishpatim.29.576?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Mishpatim 29:576)

(28) “It is the mystery of the complete Man, Male and Female, and is the secret of the whole Faith.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Terumah.24.246?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Terumah 24:246)

(29) “R. Eleazar said: This is not so. All at first comprise both male and female, and they are separated afterwards.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.6.25?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 6:25)

(30, 31) “So in the exposition of the verse, ‘Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one’ we have learnt that ‘one’ signifies the Community of Israel who clings to the Holy One, blessed be He, since, as Rabbi Simeon said, **the union of male and female is called “one”**, the Holy One, blessed be He, being called “one” only in the place where the Female also is, since the male without the female is called half the body, and half is not one. **When, however, the two halves are united, they become one body and are called one**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.16.100?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 16:100-101)

(32, 33) “R. Jose said: ‘The word ‘equity’ (mesharim, lit. equities) in the above quoted verse indicates that the **Cherubim were male and female**.’ R. Isaac said: ‘From this we learn that where there is no **union of male and female men** are not worthy to behold the divine presence’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Achrei_Mot.7.56?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Achrei Mot 7:56-8:57)

(34, 35) “Observe that **all spirits are compounded of male and female**, and when they go forth into the world **they go forth as both male and female**, and afterwards the two elements are separated. If a man is worthy they are afterwards united, and it is then that he truly meets his mate and there is a perfect union both in spirit and flesh. Hence it is written here: ‘When a woman conceives seed and bears a male’, and not ‘male and female together’, since on account of the ways of the world they are not united (at birth) as they were when they issued from on high, because the first man and his mate sinned before God.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.5.22?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 5:22)

(36) “I have written on a number of occasions that man is the purpose of Creation, that he was created in the image and likeness of G–d, and that just as **Adam originally had two faces to indicate the equality of man and woman**, so also man's body and soul respectively used to be perfect and both were sanctified to their G–d. **Woman subsequently was separated from Adam** in order to become his helpmate (partner), to enable them to unite truly and to become "one flesh" (Genesis 2:24).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shenei_Luchot_HaBerit%2C_Torah_Shebikhtav%2C_Ki_Teitzei%2C_Torah_Ohr.1?lang=en: Shenei Luchot HaBerit, Torah Shebikhtav, Ki Teitzei, Torah Ohr 1)

(37) “מצלעותיו OF HIS RIBS — The word means of his sides, similar to (Exodus 26:20) ולצלע המשכן “and for the second side of the tabernacle”; this has a bearing upon what they (the Sages) say, **(Eruvin 18a): They were created with two faces (sides).**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Rashi_on_Genesis.2.21.1?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Rashi on Genesis 2:21:1)

(38) “Listen to this. All the souls in the world, which are the fruit of the handiwork of the Almighty, are all mystically one, but when they descend to this world they are separated into male and female, though these are still conjoined.”
(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Lech_Lecha.21.204?lang=en: Zohar, Lech Lecha 21:204)

(39) “And this is the mystery of the creation of the first man, who was created with two faces (male and female combined).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Introduction.6.26?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Introduction 6:26)

(40, 41) “The colleagues here interrupted and said, ‘Rabbi, Rabbi, is there such a division between Father and Mother that from the side of the Father Man has been formed in the way of emanation, and from the side of the Mother in the way of creation?’ He replied, ‘My friends, it is not so, since the **Man of emanation was both male and female**, from the side of both Father and Mother, and that is why it says, ‘And God said, Let there be light, and there was light’: ‘let there be light’ from the side of the Father, ‘and there was light’ from the side of the Mother; and **this is the man ‘of two faces’**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.14.165?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 14:165)

(42, 43, 44, 45) “FRUIT TREE BEARING FRUIT. One degree above another, these **combining male and female**. (…) The words ‘fruit tree bearing fruit’ indicate t**he form of male and female in combination**. Their faces are ‘like the face of a man’ (Ezek. 1, 10), but they are not like the Cherubim, having large faces covered with beards, whereas the Cherubim have little faces like those of tender children. All forms are comprised in these, because they are ‘large faces’. On them are traced forms like the tracings of the Divine Name on the four cardinal points, East, West, North, and South. Michael is imprinted on the South, and all faces are turned towards him, viz. ‘the face of a man… the face of a lion… the face of an ox… the face of an eagle’ (Ibid.). **“Man” implies the union of male and female, without which the name ‘man’ (Adam) is not applied**. By him are formed the figures of the chariot of God, as it is written: ‘(On) the chariot of God are myriads of thousands of Shin’an (angels)’ (Ps. 68, 15): the word SHiN’AN expresses by means of its initials all the figures, the Shin standing for Shor (ox), the Nun for Nesher (eagle), and the Aleph for Aryeh (lion), and the final Nun representing by its shape man, who walks erect, and who **mystically combines male and female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.8.80?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 8:80-83)

(46, 47) “When these three letters descended below, together in their complete form, the name **Adam was found to comprise male and female. The female was attached to the side of the male** until God cast him into a deep slumber, during which he lay on the site of the Temple. God then sawed her off from him and adorned her like a bride and brought her to him, as it is written, ‘And he took one of his sides and closed up the place with flesh.’ (Gen. 2, 21).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.41.414?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 41:414-416)

(48, 49) "'Let us make man': the word **adam (man) implies male and female**, created wholly through the supernal and holy Wisdom. 'In our image, after our likeness': **the two being combined**, so that man should be unique in the world and ruler over all."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.73.172?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 73:172)

(50) "This is to indicate that when the world was finished the male and female were united so as to form a single whole-he' with 'sixth', which is the foundation."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.74.175?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 74:175)

(51) "THE MAN: as we have explained, male and female, together and not separated, so as to turn face to face."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.81.209?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 81:209)

(52, 53, 54) "'Male and female he created them.' From this we learn that **every figure which does not comprise male and female elements is not a true and proper figure**, and so we have laid down in the esoteric teaching of our Mishnah. Observe this. **God does not place His abode in any place where male and female are not found together**, nor are blessings found save in such a place, as it is written, AND HE BLESSED THEM AND CALLED THEIR NAME MAN ON THE DAY THAT THEY WERE CREATED: note that it says them and their name, and not him and his name. **The male is not even called man till he is united with the female**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.95.368?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 95:368-369)

(55) "R. Isaac said: 'Adam was created as a double personality (male and female), as previously explained."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Beshalach.16.233?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Beshalach 16:233)

(56, 57) “Said R. Abba: **The first man consisted of male and female**, for it says: ‘Let us make man in our image after our likeness’ (Ibid. 1, 26), which indicates that **male and female were originally created as one** and separated afterwards.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Beshalach.16.238?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Beshalach 16:238)

(58, 59, 60, 61) “There are two grades, male and female. For all the souls and spirits that enter human beings are alluded to in the words ‘generations of man (Adam)’, for they all issue from the ‘Righteous One’, and this is the ‘watering of the river that went out of Eden to water the garden’ (Gen. 2, 10). There is also another, a lower ‘Adam’, alluded to in the words, ‘on the day that God created man (Adam)’, in the same verse. In regard to the upper **Adam, the union of male and female** is at first only distantly alluded to in the words ‘this is the book’, but after they produced offspring they are called openly ‘Adam’. Then it is said that God made man in the ‘likeness’ of God. By the word ‘likeness’ we are to understand a kind of mirror in which images appear momentarily and then pass away. According to another explanation, the word ‘likeness’ refers to **the union of male and female organs**: and so the Master affirmed. In regard to the upper **Adam, the union of male and female** is at first only distantly alluded to in the words ‘this is the book’, but after they produced offspring they are called openly ‘Adam’. Then it is said that God made man in the ‘likeness’ of God. By the word ‘likeness’ we are to understand a kind of mirror in which images appear momentarily and then pass away. According to another explanation, the word ‘likeness’ refers to **the union of male and female organs**: and so the Master affirmed.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Yitro.4.63?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Yitro 4:63-67)

(62) “Man was in the Divine mind, in the inner mystery. **God created him, male and female in one**, ‘in the image of God’, symbolized by the palm.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Yitro.11.170?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Yitro 11:170)

(63) “Observe that at the creation of Adam the Holy One, blessed be He, made him male and female together, female behind and male before.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Pekudei.21.202?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Pekudei 21:202)

(64) “And therefore ‘God formed man dust from the ground’, etc. (Gen. 2, 7), that he might join one with the other and himself be perfect. And therefore **God created man male and female** that he might be perfect.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.13.94?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 13:94)

(65) “For when God created man, He created him without flaw, as it is written, ‘God made man upright’ (yashar, lit. straight) (Eccles. 7, 20). The word **‘man’ (adam) means male and female, the female being included in the male**, and hence it says ‘upright’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.44.315?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 44:315)

(66) “The word ‘man’ (adam) indicates a combination of male and female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.18.80?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 18:80)

(67) “For since Scripture says ‘And God created man in his own image’, why repeat ‘in the image of God created he him’? But what it signifies is a two-foldness of grades, of **male and female comprised within the man**, which made him a duality of prosopa, so that he was complete in all respects, and he contemplated in wisdom both what was above and what was below.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bamidbar.1.2?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bamidbar 1:2)

(68, 69, 70) “Said R. Judah: ‘But there is a teaching that the term **‘Adam’ signifies the conjunction of male and female**?’ R. Eleazar in reply said: ‘Assuredly so. **He who achieves for himself the union of male and female is called Adam**, and in this way has the fear of sin. He attains, moreover, to the virtue of humility, and even the degree of grace. Contrariwise, he who remains without that union possesses neither fear nor humility nor the state of grace. So Scripture says: ‘For I have said: The world is built by Grace’ (Ibid. 89, 3), to wit, by **Adam, who denotes the union of male and female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Nasso.13.141?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Nasso 13:141)

(71, 72) “Alternatively, this duplication in the language of creation can be explained in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar, as Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, created two faces [*du partzufin*] on **Adam the first man; he was created both male and female in a single body**, as it is stated: ‘You have formed me [*tzartani*] behind and before’ (Psalms 139:5); *tzartani* is derived from the word *tzura* [face]. **God formed two faces on a single creation**, back and front. It is stated: ‘And the *tzela* which the Lord, God, had taken from the man, He made a woman, and brought her unto the man’ (Genesis 2:22).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Berakhot.61a.5?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Berakhot 61a:5)

(73, 74, 75, 76) “The Gemara suggests: Let us say that they disagree about this: One Sage holds: It was one act of creation with which man was created. And one Sage holds: It was two acts of creation with which man was created. The first opinion, that there was one act of creation, is based on the concept that **man was created with two sides, one male and one female**. There was no additional act of creation. **Man and woman were subsequently separated into two independent beings**. Therefore, there is no need for the two blessings: Who created mankind, and: Who created mankind in His image. The second opinion is that there were in fact two separate acts of creation. Therefore, it is appropriate to recite two blessings with regard to the creation of mankind. The Gemara rejects that suggestion: No, everyone agrees that it was only one act of creation. However, one Sage holds: It is according to the initial thought that we proceed. And one Sage holds: It is according to the action that we proceed. **God’s initial thought was to create man and woman as separate entities. Ultimately, they were created as one entity**. That explanation is like the following. Rav Yehuda raises a contradiction. In one verse it is written: ‘And God created man in His own image’ (Genesis 1:27), indicating one act of creation, and in another verse it is written: ‘Male and female He created them’ (Genesis 5:2), indicating two acts. How can this apparent contradiction be resolved? Initially, the thought entered God’s mind to create two, but **ultimately only one was actually created**.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Ketubot.8a.8?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Ketubot 8a:8-9)

(77, 78) “If there is uncertainty whether or not to circumcise a baby, and likewise in the case of a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]** baby, who possesses **both male and female genitals**, one does not desecrate Shabbat to perform the circumcision, since it is not certain that the circumcision is required. And Rabbi Yehuda permits doing so **for a hermaphrodite** baby.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.134b.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 134b:2)

(79, 80, 81, 82) "We learned in the mishna: If there is uncertainty whether or not to circumcise a baby, and likewise in the case of a **hermaphrodite baby**, one does not desecrate Shabbat to perform the circumcision of a **hermaphrodite**, even on the eighth day following the birth. The Sages taught in a baraita: The verse states: “And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Leviticus 12:3), and they interpreted the verse: “His foreskin” indicates that only the circumcision of his halakhically certain foreskin overrides Shabbat, and the circumcision of a halakhically uncertain foreskin does not override Shabbat. And by means of the same inference from the term his foreskin, derive that circumcision of his definite foreskin overrides Shabbat, and circumcising the foreskin of a **hermaphrodite baby**, with regard to whom there is uncertainty whether or not circumcision is required, does not override Shabbat. Rabbi Yehuda says: The circumcision of a **hermaphrodite** overrides Shabbat, and if he is not circumcised, when he reaches majority he is punishable by karet.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.134b.23?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 134b:23-135a:2)

(83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90) “We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda permits circumcising a **hermaphrodite** on Shabbat. Rav Sheizvi said that Rav Ḥisda said: Not with regard to all matters did Rabbi Yehuda say that a **hermaphrodite** is considered a male; it was only with regard to circumcision, as if you say so, that the legal status of a **hermaphrodite** is that of a male in every sense, then even with regard to vows of valuation, he should be valuated. And from where do we derive that he is not valuated? As it was taught in the Sifra, the halakhic midrash on Leviticus, with regard to the verse: “Then your valuation shall be for the male from the age of twenty years until the age of sixty years, your valuation shall be fifty shekel of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary” (Leviticus 27:3). The Sages inferred: “The male” means the definite male but not a **tumtum or a hermaphrodite**. I might have thought that these shall not be valuated according to the valuation of a man, but shall be valuated according to the valuation of a woman. Therefore, the verse states: “The male,” and in the following verse: “And if she is a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekels” (Leviticus 27:4), indicating: Only a definite male or a definite female, but not a **tumtum or a hermaphrodite**, which are categorized as neither male nor female. And an unattributed halakha cited in the Sifra generally reflects the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We too also learned in a mishna that Rabbi Yehuda does not consider a **hermaphrodite** to be a male in every sense. The Sages disagreed over sanctification of the waters of a purification offering, i.e., the placing of the ashes of the red heifer in potable, running spring water: Everyone is fit to sanctify the waters of a purification offering, except for a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor. Rabbi Yehuda deems a minor fit, but deems a woman and a **hermaphrodite** unfit. Apparently, Rabbi Yehuda does not consider the legal status of a **hermaphrodite** to be like that of a male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.136b.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 136b:4-137a:3)

(91) “Rabbi Yehuda qualifies a minor, but disqualifies a woman and a hermaphrodite.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yoma.43a.8?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yoma 43a:8)

(92) “The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna in tractate *Para*: Everyone is qualified to sprinkle the purification waters, except for **a person whose sexual organs are concealed [*tumtum*]**, and a **hermaphrodite [*androginus*]**, and a woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yoma.43a.14?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yoma 43a:14)

(93, 94) “The mishna taught: And a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are exempt from the mitzva of appearance in the Temple. The Sages taught, with regard to the verse: “Three occasions in the year all your males will appear before the Lord God” (Exodus 23:17), had the verse simply said “males,” this would serve to exclude women from this mitzva. By specifying “your males,” it comes to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** as well.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Chagigah.4a.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Chagigah 4a:3)

(95, 96, 97) “The Master said in the *baraita*: ‘Your males’ comes to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite.** The Gemara asks: **Granted,** the exclusion of **a hermaphrodite** was necessary, as it could enter your mind to say that since he possesses an aspect of masculinity, i.e., he has a male sexual organ, he should be obligated like a male. Therefore, the *baraita* teaches us that a **hermaphrodite is a being unto itself, which is neither male nor female**. However**,** as the status of **a *tumtum*,** who lacks external sexual organs, is a halakhic uncertainty, is a verse necessary to exclude an uncertainty? Abaye said: It is referring to a case when the testicles of a ***tumtum*** are on the outside, although his penis is not visible. The verse teaches that this ***tumtum*** is not obligated in the mitzva of appearance, despite the fact that he is certainly male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Chagigah.4a.6?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Chagigah 4a:6-7)

(98) “The Gemara raises an objection from a different source: A priest who is a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma*, but his wives and slaves may partake of it. A priest who had been circumcised, but subsequently the residual foreskin was drawn forward, and similarly one who was born circumcised, i.e., without a foreskin, may partake of *teruma*. A priest who is a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, possessing both male and female genitals, and was circumcised may partake of *teruma*, as whether he is male or female he is entitled to eat *teruma*, but he may not partake of sacrificial food, which is permitted only to male priests, as he might not be a male. A priest who is a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma* or sacrificial food, as he might be a male, and since **his member is hidden** he cannot be circumcised.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.72a.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 72a:10)

(99, 100, 101) “The Gemara raises an objection from that which was taught in the *Tosefta* (*Para* 5:5): If a ***tumtum*** sanctified the purification waters by placing a small amount of ashes from the red heifer into springwater that had been placed into a container for that purpose, his sanctification is invalid because there is uncertainty as to whether he is uncircumcised, and an uncircumcised man is disqualified from sanctifying the purification waters. But if a **hermaphrodite** sanctified the purification waters, his sanctification is valid. Rabbi Yehuda disagrees and says: Even if a **hermaphrodite** sanctified the purification waters, his sanctification is invalid, because there is uncertainty as to whether a **hermaphrodite** is a woman, and a woman is disqualified from sanctifying the purification waters.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.72b.11?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 72b:11)

(102, 103) “The Gemara comments: And the Rabbis and Rabbi Yehuda follow their usual line of reasoning with regard to a **hermaphrodite**. As it is taught in a *baraita*: All are fit to sanctify the purification waters except for a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor. Rabbi Yehuda deems a minor fit for the task, but deems a woman and a **hermaphrodite** unfit.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.72b.15?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 72b:15)

(104) “Likewise, the wife of a **seris chammah (one born without testicles), and a hermaphrodite** is subject to neither chalitzah not yibum, it being written (Ibid. 5): "and he have no son" — to exclude those who are incapable of begetting children.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Yevamot.2.3?ven=english|The_Mishna_with_Obadiah_Bartenura_by_Rabbi_Shraga_Silverstein&lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Yevamot 2:3)

(105, 106, 107, 108) “MISHNA: If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*. Rabbi Yehuda says: If a ***tumtum*, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform *ḥalitza*, because he is treated like a **eunuch**. A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman but he may not be married by a man, as he is considered a man. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had had relations with a male. GEMARA: The Gemara questions the mishna’s teaching concerning a priest who was sexually impotent from birth: This is obvious; why should such a priest not enable his wife to partake of *teruma*? The Gemara answers: This *halakha* is necessary lest you say that since the verse states: “And such as are born in his house, they eat of his bread” (Leviticus 22:11), the allowance to eat *teruma* depends on the priest’s capacity to father children, i.e., that only one who can father children enables his wife to eat *teruma*, but one who cannot father children does not enable his wife to eat *teruma*. Therefore, the *tanna* teaches us that the priest’s capacity to have children is irrelevant. It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.81a.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 81a:3-6)

(109, 110) But I, Rabbi Yoḥanan, said what I said in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei that a priest who is a **hermaphrodite** enables his wife to eat *teruma*, and Rabbi Yosei himself maintains that even nowadays the *halakha* of *teruma* is in effect by Torah law. Accordingly, I argued that a **hermaphrodite** enables his wife to eat not only *teruma*, but even the breast and thigh of peace-offerings.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.82b.1?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 82b:1)

(111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122) “We learned in the mishna: A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman. This formulation indicates that he may do so *ab initio*, as he is considered a full-fledged male. Accordingly, a **hermaphrodite** who is a priest should enable his wife to eat the breast and thigh of peace-offerings, as is maintained by Rabbi Yoḥanan, and against the opinion of Reish Lakish. The Gemara rejects this argument and suggests that the text be emended: Teach in the mishna: If he married. That is to say, if he married a woman, the marriage is valid and a bill of divorce is required, as it is possible that he is a male. But even if he married, he does not enable his wife to eat *teruma*, as he may be a female. The Gemara raises a difficulty: But doesn’t the mishna teach that he may marry a woman, which indicates that he may do so *ab initio*? The Gemara rejects this argument: And according to your reasoning, what is the meaning of the next clause: But he may not be married to a man? This teaching is certainly referring to a case after the fact, as, if he is a full-fledged male there would be no reason to say that he may not be married to a man *ab initio*. Rather, what is the meaning of: He may not be married to a man? It means that even after the fact the marriage is not valid. This being the case, when the mishna states that a **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman, it is also speaking after the fact. It may be said in response: No; the words: May marry, indicate that a **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman *ab initio*, whereas the words: But he may not be married, mean that his marriage to a man is not valid even after the fact. Accordingly, the difficulty raised against Reish Lakish remains. The Gemara challenges this understanding: But from the fact that the mishna teaches in the latter clause: Rabbi Eliezer says that if a man had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had relations with a male, this proves by inference that the first *tanna* is uncertain as to whether or not a **hermaphrodite** is considered a full-fledged male, and this presents a difficulty to Rabbi Yoḥanan’s opinion. The Gemara answers: No, it is obvious both to this Master and to that Master that a **hermaphrodite** is deemed a full-fledged male. The practical difference between them relates to the question of whether one is liable to receive the punishment of stoning for intercourse with him at only one place or at two places. As one Sage, the first *tanna*, holds that one is liable to be punished with stoning on a **hermaphrodite**’s account for intercourse at two places, whether he penetrated him anally, in the manner of homosexual intercourse, or through his female organ. Since the **hermaphrodite** is deemed a male, one is liable to be punished with stoning for intercourse at either place. And one Sage, Rabbi Eliezer, holds that one is liable to be punished with stoning for relations with a **hermaphrodite** only if he penetrated him anally, as if he were a male. Rav said: The mishna here, which states that according to Rabbi Yosei a priest who is a **hermaphrodite** enables his wife to eat *teruma*, is not to be relied upon in the presence of a *baraita* that teaches otherwise. As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yosei says: **A hermaphrodite is a creature unto himself, and the Sages did not determine whether he is a male or a female.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.82b.7?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 82b:7-83a:1)

(123, 124) “The Sages of the school of Rav said in the name of Rav that the *halakha* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, both with regard to the *halakha* of a **hermaphrodite** and with regard to the *halakha* of grafting. And Shmuel says: The *halakha* is in accordance with his opinion with regard to the laws of protracted labor and forfeiture. The Gemara clarifies: The *halakha* of a **hermaphrodite is that which we just said, that he is considered a creature unto himself** (Rabbeinu Ḥananel).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.83a.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 83a:4-5)

(125, 126, 127) “A dilemma was raised before the Sages: As for a **hermaphrodite**, what did Shmuel say? It was stated in the name of Rav that the *halakha* is ruled in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei with regard to a **hermaphrodite**, but no ruling was attributed to Shmuel concerning this case. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear, as Shmuel said to Rav Anan: The *baraita* is not to be relied upon in the presence of the mishna. This indicates that Shmuel rejects Rabbi Yosei’s opinion as stated in the *baraita* that a **hermaphrodite is considered a creature unto himself**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.83b.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 83b:2)

(128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142, 143, 144, 145) “Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda said that Rabbi Abba, brother of Rabbi Yehuda bar Zavdi, said that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: With regard to a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account for intercourse at two places, whether one penetrated him anally, in the manner of homosexual intercourse, or through his female organ. The Gemara raises an objection against this from the following teaching. Rabbi Eliezer said: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to be punished with stoning on his account as if he had relations with a male. In what case is this statement said? It is if he had relations with him through his male organ, i.e., in the manner of homosexual intercourse, but if he engaged in intercourse with him through his female organ, he is exempt. The Gemara answers that Rav stated his opinion in accordance with the opinion of this *tanna*, as it is taught in the following *baraita*: Rabbi Simai says: With regard to a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to be punished with stoning on his account for intercourse at two places. The Gemara asks: What is the reasoning of Rabbi Simai? Rava said: The Sage bar Hamedurei explained the matter to me, based on an allusion to this *halakha* found in the Bible. The verse states: “And you shall not lie with a male as with a woman [*mishkevei isha*]” (Leviticus 18:22). The phrase *mishkevei isha*, referring to lying with a woman, appears in the plural. Now, what male has two manners of lying? You must say that this is referring to a **hermaphrodite**, and the plural form *mishkevei*, meaning: Lyings, indicates that there is liability for both manners of intercourse with him. The Gemara asks: And how do the Rabbis who disagree with Rabbi Simai counter this argument? The Gemara explains: Although he has two manners of lying, it is nevertheless written: “With a male,” indicating that one is liable to be stoned on a **hermaphrodite**’s account only if he had relations with him in the manner of a male. The Gemara asks: And the

Rabbis, who explain this entire verse as referring to a **hermaphrodite**, from where do they derive that a man is prohibited from engaging in relations with an ordinary male? The Gemara answers: They derive it from the words “a woman.” The Gemara asks further: And from where do the Rabbis derive that one is liable to be punished for engaging in intercourse with a woman who is forbidden to him even if he engaged in relations in an unnatural manner, i.e., anal intercourse? The Gemara responds: They derive it from the inclusive “and” in “and…with a woman.” Rav Shezvi said that Rav Ḥisda said: Not in all regards did Rabbi Eliezer say that a **hermaphrodite** is a proper male. As, if you say so, that a **hermaphrodite** is a proper male in every aspect, then with regard to consecrated animals an animal that is a **hermaphrodite** should become sacred if one consecrated it. And from where do we derive that it does not become sacred? As the Sages taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a bird used for sexual relations with a human being, and one set aside for idolatrous purposes, and one that itself was worshipped as an idol, and one given as payment to a prostitute (see Deuteronomy 23:19), and one that was the price of a dog received in exchange for the sale of a dog (see Deuteronomy 23:19), and similarly, a bird that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, if one killed any of these birds by pinching their necks in the manner of an offering rather than by ritual slaughter, the birds render him and the garments he is wearing ritually impure, when the birds are eaten and come into contact with his throat. The reason is that pinching is valid only for sacrificial birds; any other bird that is killed by pinching is deemed an unslaughtered carcass. Since none of these birds are fit to be sacrificed, pinching their necks renders them unslaughtered carcasses, and the unslaughtered carcass of a clean bird imparts ritual impurity when it is eaten and reaches the individual’s throat. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one pinched the neck of a bird that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, it does not render him and the garments he is wearing ritually impure when it is eaten and comes into contact with his throat, as the sanctity of an offering does in fact apply to it. As Rabbi Eliezer would say: Wherever it is explicitly stated in the Torah “male” and “female,” you are to remove a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as their gender status is in doubt. This is true of animal offerings, with regard to which the Torah uses the terms male and female. In the case of a bird-offering, however, since male and female are not stated with regard to it, but instead the Torah simply mentions turtledoves and young pigeons, you are not to remove a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as they are fit for the altar. It is evident then that Rabbi Eliezer maintains that a **hermaphrodite** is not considered a proper male with respect to offerings. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We too learned this explicitly in a *baraita* that states: Rabbi Eliezer says: Forbidden crossbred livestock, an animal with a condition that will cause it to die within twelve months [*tereifa*], an animal delivered through the abdominal wall, and an animal that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite** do not become sacred and do not render another animal sacred in their place. And Shmuel said: They do not become sacred by way of substitution, i.e., if one had an animal that had been designated as an offering, and he wished to substitute one of these animals for it, the substituted animal does not become sacred. And they themselves do not render another animal sacred when it is made a substitute for them. If one designated one of these animals as an offering and he wished to substitute another animal for it, it does not become sacred. The Gemara concludes: Learn from this that Rabbi Eliezer does not consider a **hermaphrodite** to be a proper male. It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to be punished with stoning on his account as if one had relations with a male. It is taught on this matter in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: When I went to learn Torah from Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua, his students joined together against me like the roosters of

Beit Bukya, highly aggressive animals that do not allow other creatures to remain among them, and they did not let me learn there. Therefore, I managed to learn only one thing in our mishna, which is that Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to be punished with stoning on his account as if one had relations with a male."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.83b.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 83b:9-84a:3)

(146,147) "The Sages taught: There are ten types of priests to whom one may not distribute *teruma* in the granary, and they are: A deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor, a person whose sexual organs are concealed **[*tumtum*]**, and a **hermaphrodite**, and a slave, and a woman, and an uncircumcised man, and a ritually impure man, and one who marries a woman who is unfit for him, i.e., who is unfit to marry a priest. And with regard to all of them, one may send *teruma* to them, to their homes, with the exception of a ritually impure man and one who marries a woman who is unfit for him. It is also inappropriate to distribute *teruma* to a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, as they are each an unusual creature of their own kind."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.99b.13?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 99b:13-100a:1)

(148, 149) "If a daughter, a ***tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite [*androginos*]** is born to him, he is not a nazirite, since a son was not born to him. However, if he says: I am hereby a nazirite when I will have a child, then even if a daughter, a ***tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite** is born to him, he is a nazirite."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Nazir.12b.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Nazir 12b:10)

(150, 151) "The Gemara answers: This *halakha* is stated due to the latter clause of that mishna, which states that if a daughter, **a *tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite** are born to him, he is not a nazirite. The Gemara questions this, too: Isn't that obvious, since he specified a son? The Gemara answers: It is necessary lest you say he did not literally mean a son, but rather he meant to say: When I will be built up by means of any child, including the types listed. The mishna therefore teaches us that this is not the case. The mishna also taught: And if he said: When I have a child, then even if he has a daughter, a ***tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite**, his vow takes effect."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Nazir.13a.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Nazir 13a:3-4)

(152) “The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna (*Nidda* 28a): A woman who miscarries **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]** observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth to a male and to a female. **Since it is uncertain whether the fetus is male or female**, the woman must observe the *halakhot* of ritual impurity according to both possibilities. This appears to be a conclusive refutation of the statement of Rav Sherevya that a woman who gives birth to a ***tumtum*** is not rendered impure at all. The Gemara affirms: This is a conclusive refutation.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.127a.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 127a:4)

(153) “And with regard to the latter clause of the mishna, which grants the ***tumtum*** nothing at all, there we arrive at the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, as it is taught in a mishna (*Temura* 24b): If one consecrates a firstborn animal while it is still a fetus, stating that if it is male it shall be a burnt-offering and if it is female it shall be a peace-offering, and the mother gave birth to a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: It is not imbued with sanctity, as **it is neither male nor female**. So too, in the case discussed in the mishna here, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel maintains that the ***tumtum*** receives nothing, as **he is considered to be a distinct entity of indeterminate sex, neither male nor female**. The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: A ***tumtum*** inherits as a son and is sustained as a daughter. Granted, according to Rava, the *baraita* can be explained to mean that the clause: Inherits as a son, is in the case of a small estate, as the daughters direct the ***tumtum*** to the sons, and just as there is no inheritance for the sons, there is none for the ***tumtum*** either. And the clause: And is sustained as a daughter, is in the case of a large estate, as the sons direct the ***tumtum*** to the daughters, and the ***tumtum*** receives sustenance along with them. But according to the opinion of Abaye, what does it mean that the ***tumtum*** is sustained as a daughter, since Abaye maintains that the ***tumtum*** does not have the rights of a daughter? The Gemara responds: And according to your reasoning, even according to Rava, what does it mean that a ***tumtum*** inherits as a son, since Rava concedes that the ***tumtum*** and sons do not actually inherit anything? Rather, the *baraita* means that it is fitting for the ***tumtum*** to inherit but he does not actually inherit. Here too, with regard to sustenance, according to Abaye, the *baraita* means that it is fitting for the ***tumtum*** to be sustained, but he is not actually sustained.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.140b.8?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 140b:8-141a:1)

(154) “Why must the verse state: “For any man [*ish ish*],” repeating the term *ish*? It is to include not only a son, but also a daughter, **one whose sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*], and a hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.66a.8?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 66a:8)

(155) “What is the meaning when the verse states redundantly: “*Ish ish*”? It serves to include not only a son, but also a daughter, **one whose sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*], and a hermaphrodite** who curse their parent.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.85b.8?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 85b:8)

(156) “The Gemara answers: He requires the other verse to include a daughter, **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite** in the prohibition against cursing a parent.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.85b.11?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 85b:11)

(157) “Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We learn in the *baraita* as well: A bird that was the object of bestiality, or that was set aside for idol worship, or that was worshipped as a deity, or that was given as payment to a prostitute or as the price of a dog, or that was **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, in all of those cases, if its nape was pinched, it renders the garments of one who swallows an olive-bulk from the carcass ritually impure when it is in the throat, as is the *halakha* with regard to all unslaughtered carcasses of birds.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zevachim.85b.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Zevachim 85b:10)

(158, 159) “And one does not slaughter a ***tumtum***, whose sexual organs are concealed, and a **hermaphrodite [*ve’anderoginos*]**, which **has both male and female sexual organs**, neither in the Temple nor in the rest of the country. Rabbi Shimon says: You have no blemish greater than that, and it may be slaughtered. And the Rabbis say: The halakhic status of a h**ermaphrodite** is not that of a firstborn; rather, its halakhic status is that of a non-sacred animal that may be shorn and utilized for labor.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41a.6?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41a:6)

(160, 161) “The mishna teaches that one does not slaughter a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, neither in the Temple nor in the rest of the country. The Gemara asks: Granted, one does not slaughter a ***tumtum***, neither in the Temple, as perhaps it is a female and therefore does not have firstborn status and may not be sacrificed, nor in the rest of the country, as perhaps it is a male and it does not have a blemish, in which case he would be slaughtering a sacrificial animal. But in the case of a **hermaphrodite**, granted that one does not slaughter it in the Temple, as perhaps it is a female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41a.17?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41a:17-18)

(162, 163, 164) “Consequently, one cannot say that the female sex organ of a **hermaphrodite** should be considered a blemish for which one may slaughter a firstborn outside the Temple. In this connection, the Gemara cites the statement of the mishna with regard to a **hermaphrodite**: Rabbi Yishmael says: You have no blemish greater than that, and it may be slaughtered. Evidently, Rabbi Yishmael maintains that the female sex organ of a **hermaphrodite** is considered a blemish.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41a.21?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41a:21-22)

(165, 166, 167, 168) “Rava raises a dilemma: What is the reason of Rabbi Yishmael that a **hermaphrodite** is definitely blemished? Is it obvious to him that a **hermaphrodite** animal is a male that has firstborn status, and it comes with its blemish, i.e., the female sex organ, and therefore it is permitted to slaughter it outside the Temple? Or perhaps Rabbi Yishmael is uncertain whether or not a **hermaphrodite** is considered a male, and he says his ruling in the manner of: If you say. In other words, if you say that a **hermaphrodite** animal is a firstborn, it comes with its blemish, and it may be slaughtered outside the Temple.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41b.1?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41b:1)

(169, 170, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194, 195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202) “The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita*: Rabbi Ilai says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: A **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn, and it comes with its blemish. Learn from the *baraita* that it is obvious to Rabbi Yishmael that a **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn. The Gemara responds: But perhaps he said his ruling in the manner of: If you say, as explained earlier. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear another *baraita*. It states with regard to a burnt offering from cattle: “A male” (Leviticus 1:3), from which it can be inferred: But not a female. When it says below, with regard to a burnt offering from sheep: “A male” (Leviticus 1:10), a second time, it is difficult to understand, as there is no need for the verse to state this. Why must the verse state “a male” again? This serves to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, which are disqualified from being sacrificed as burnt offerings. The Gemara analyzes this *baraita*: Whose opinion is this? If we say it is the opinion of the first *tanna* of the mishna, who maintains that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** may not be slaughtered in the Temple or in the rest of the country, then the status of a **hermaphrodite** is uncertain, as **it is unknown whether it is male or female**. But does a verse come to exclude a case of uncertainty? Rather, perhaps this *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of the latter Rabbis in the mishna, who hold that a **hermaphrodite** is definitely not a male, but a distinct entity. Therefore, it is necessary for a verse to exclude it. This, too, is difficult, as according to these Rabbis the exclusion of a female, **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite** is derived from one verse alone. The Gemara elaborates: As with regard to a firstborn, it is one “male” alone that is written, from which the Rabbis exclude all of the three categories from firstborn status. By contrast, the *baraita* excludes a female from one mention of the word “male” and **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from another mention of the word “male.” Rather, it is obvious that the *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael. And in

that case, granted, if you say that it is obvious to Rabbi Yishmael that a **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn male, that is why a verse was necessary to exclude a **hermaphrodite** from being brought as a burnt offering. But if you say that Rabbi Yishmael is uncertain whether or not a **hermaphrodite** is considered a male, is it necessary for the verse to exclude a case of uncertainty? The Gemara responds: Actually, the *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of the latter Rabbis, who maintain that a **hermaphrodite** is not a male, but a distinct entity. And as for the difficulty that in the case of a firstborn they excluded a female, **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite** from a single verse, that is not so. With regard to a firstborn there are also two verses written: "Males" (Deuteronomy 15:19), and: "That is a male" (Exodus 13:12). As in the case of a burnt offering, one of these serves to exclude a female, while the other serves to exclude **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**. The mishna teaches: And the Rabbis say: A **hermaphrodite** does not have firstborn status; rather, its status is that of a non-sacred animal that may be shorn and utilized for labor. Rav Ḥisda says: This dispute applies to **a hermaphrodite, which the Rabbis maintain is a distinct entity, as it has both male and female sex organs**, and therefore it does not have firstborn status. But with regard to a ***tumtum***, whose genitalia is covered by skin, everyone agrees that it is an uncertain case, as it is definitely either a male or a female, but there is uncertainty as to which it is. And consequently, it is consecrated due to uncertainty, and it may not be slaughtered either in the Temple or in the rest of the country. Rava said to Rav Ḥisda: If that is so, that a ***tumtum*** is certainly either a male or a female, with regard to valuations, when someone vows to give the valuation of a ***tumtum***, it should be valuated, either in accordance with the valuation of a man or a woman. Why, then, is it taught in a *baraita* that the verse: "Then your valuation shall be for the male" (Leviticus 27:3), includes one whose status as a male is certain but not a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**? The Gemara answers: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***, as it is referring only to a **hermaphrodite**, which is a distinct entity. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear the continuation of that *baraita*: One might have thought that these shall not be valuated according to the valuation of a man, but they shall be valuated according to the valuation of a woman. Therefore, the verse states: "The male," and in the following verse it states: "And if she is a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekels" (Leviticus 27:4), indicating only one whose status as a male or female is certain, but not **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite, which are categorized as neither male nor female**. The Gemara again answers: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***, as it is referring only to a **hermaphrodite**. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita* discussing the peace offering, with regard to which it states: "Whether male or female" (Leviticus 3:1). This indicates: Only a definite male or a definite female, but not **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**. Yet again the Gemara responds: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita*: It states with regard to a burnt offering from cattle: "A male" (Leviticus 1:3), from which it can be inferred: But not a female. When it says below, with regard to a burnt offering from sheep: "A male" (Leviticus 1:10), a second time, it is difficult to understand, as there is no need for the verse to state this. Why must the verse state "a male" again? This serves to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, which are disqualified as burnt offerings. The Gemara answers: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita* discussing the *halakhot* of ritual impurity imparted by a bird in the throat: Any bird that was not slaughtered in the proper manner, i.e., in its neck with a knife, has the status of a carcass. This carcass renders the one who eats it impure when it is in his throat. Bird offerings, which are killed by pinching the nape of the neck with a fingernail, are the exception to this principle, and they do not impart impurity. With

regard to a bird that is worshipped as a deity, or one set aside for idol worship, or one given as payment to a prostitute, or one that was given as the price of a dog (see Deuteronomy 23:19), and similarly with regard to a bird that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, if one killed any of them by pinching, they are ritually impure, as they are disqualified as offerings, and the pinching does not purify them. Therefore, they all render a person and the garments he is wearing ritually impure if an olive-bulk of them comes into contact with the throat while eating. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one pinched the neck of a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, it does not render the person and the garments he is wearing ritually impure when they are in the throat, as they are in fact fit to be sacrificed. As Rabbi Eliezer would say: Wherever it is stated explicitly in the Torah: "Male," and: "Female," you should exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as their status is uncertain. This applies to animal offerings, with regard to which the Torah states "male" and "female." But in the case of a bird offering, since "male" and "female" are not stated with regard to it, but simply doves and pigeons are stated with regard to it, you do not exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as they are fit for the altar. Now if a ***tumtum*** is considered either definitely a male or a female, then why does the first *tanna* disqualify it from being sacrificed? The Gemara again replies: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear that Rabbi Elazar says: An animal with a condition that will cause it to die within twelve months [*tereifa*], and prohibited diverse kinds of livestock, and an animal born by caesarean section, and an animal that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite** do not become consecrated and do not render another animal consecrated in their place. And Shmuel says in explanation: They do not become consecrated by substitution, i.e., if one sought to substitute one of these animals for a sacrificial animal, it does not become sacred. And if one of these was born to a sacrificial animal, they do not render a non-sacred animal consecrated in a case where one wanted to render it a substitute for them. And if a ***tumtum*** is either a male or female, why would it not become consecrated and render another animal consecrated? The Gemara answers: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a slightly different version of that *baraita*. Rabbi Elazar says: There are five types of animals that do not become consecrated and do not render another animal consecrated, and they are: A *tereifa*, and prohibited diverse kinds of livestock, and an animal born by caesarean section, and an animal that is **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite**. And if you would say: Here too, omit from this *baraita* a ***tumtum***, then there are only four types of animals listed in the *baraita*. The Gemara answers: Remove the mention of a ***tumtum*** and in its place insert an orphan, i.e., an animal born after the death of its mother, which is also disqualified as a sacrifice. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that this question of whether a ***tumtum*** is a distinct entity or is definitely either a male or female is the subject of a dispute between *tanna'im*. As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Ilai says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: A **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn, and it comes with its blemish; and the Rabbis say: It is not imbued with sanctity. Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: The verse states: "Males" (Deuteronomy 15:19), and wherever it is stated: Male," this serves to exclude only **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**. Since according to Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda it is necessary for a verse to exclude a ***tumtum*, like a hermaphrodite**, from the category of a male, evidently in his opinion a ***tumtum*** is not considered to be one whose status as a male is uncertain but a distinct entity. The Gemara analyzes this *baraita*: And if you would say: Here too, omit from this *baraita* a ***tumtum***, then the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda is the same as that of the Rabbis, as they too maintain that a **hermaphrodite** is not sacred. Rather, is it not that the difference between them is with regard to the status of a ***tumtum***, as the first *tanna*, i.e., the Rabbis,

holds: It is not imbued with sanctity, and they are referring specifically to a **hermaphrodite**, which was the subject of Rabbi Ilai's statement, but a ***tumtum*** is an uncertain case, and therefore it is sacred due to uncertainty. ben Yehuda comes to say: A ***tumtum*** is not of uncertain status, but a distinct entity, and it is not sacred at all. The Gemara responds: No, everyone agrees with regard to the statement that a ***tumtum*** is a distinct entity that there is no doubt that this is incorrect. Where there is doubt is with regard to whether it is a male or a female. In addition, in a case where the ***tumtum*** urinates from the place of the male sex organ, then everyone agrees that it is a male. When they disagree is in the case of a ***tumtum*** that urinates from the place of the female sex organ. One Sage, the Rabbis, holds that we are concerned that perhaps its male sex organ was inverted toward its female sex organ; therefore, it is of uncertain status. And one Sage, Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda, holds that we are not concerned about this possibility; rather, it is definitely a female. And Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda maintains in accordance with that which Rabbi Elazar ruled: With regard to a firstborn animal that urinates from the place where the female sex organ is found, it is non-sacred, as it is certainly a female. Rabbi Yoḥanan wondered about this ruling of Rabbi Elazar: Who is the Sage who is not concerned about the opinion of the first *tanna* in the mishna and about the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, who maintain that a ***tumtum*** is a case of uncertainty? The Gemara asks: And let Rabbi Yoḥanan also say: Who is this who is not concerned about the opinion of the latter Rabbis in the mishna, as Rav Ḥisda says: This dispute refers to a **hermaphrodite**; but with regard to a ***tumtum***, everyone agrees that it is an uncertain case. The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yoḥanan does not hold in accordance with that statement of Rav Ḥisda; rather, he maintains that according to the latter Rabbis a ***tumtum*** is a distinct entity. The Gemara asks: If Rabbi Yoḥanan does not hold in accordance with Rav Ḥisda, why did he wonder about Rabbi Elazar's ruling? Let him say that Rabbi Elazar said his opinion in accordance with the opinion of the latter Rabbis. The Gemara answers: That is indeed what he is saying: Who is the Sage who leaves aside the opinion of two Sages, the first *tanna* and Rabbi Yishmael, and acts in accordance with one opinion, the latter Rabbis? The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Elazar, in accordance with whose opinion does he hold? The Gemara answers that he holds in accordance with that which Reish Lakish says: The Sages said that the halakhic status of a ***tumtum*** is an uncertain case only with regard to a person, since the male sex organ and the female sex organ are in one place, i.e., a man and a woman urinate from the same area of the body. Since that area is concealed in the case of a ***tumtum***, its status is uncertain. But with regard to a ***tumtum*** animal, there is no uncertainty whether it is a male or a female, as the genitals of a male and a female are not found in the same place. Rather, if it urinates from the place of the male sex organ, it is a male; if it urinates from the place of the female sex organ, it is a female. Rav Oshaya objects to this: And let us be concerned that perhaps its male sex organ was turned round to the place of its female sex organ. Abaye said to him: In accordance with whose opinion do you raise this objection? Is it in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who is concerned about the minority of cases? The *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, and therefore one should follow the majority of animals, to whom this does not occur. Abaye bar Avin and Rav Ḥananya bar Avin both say: You may even say that Rav Oshaya's objection is in accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who are not concerned about a minority. The reason is that since in this case, the animal has changed in that it is different from typical animals, as it is a ***tumtum***, perhaps it is also changed with regard to its male sex organ being inverted toward the female sex organ. If so, the Sages disagree with regard to this principle: There are those who say that since it has changed, it has changed, and there are those who say that the claim that since it has

changed, it has changed is not accepted. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the question of whether an animal that has changed in one respect has changed in a different respect, or whether it has not changed, is the subject of a dispute between *tanna'im*. As it is taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a ***tumtum*** who betrothed a woman, the betrothal is considered a betrothal, due to uncertainty, as the ***tumtum*** might be a male; and similarly, if the ***tumtum*** was betrothed by a man, the betrothal is deemed a betrothal due to uncertainty, as the ***tumtum*** might be a female. The *baraita* continues: And if the brother of the ***tumtum*** died childless, and there is no other brother who can perform levirate marriage with the widow, the ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza*, i.e., his brother's widow removes his shoe, as the ***tumtum*** might be a male, and she would require *ḥalitza* to release her from the levirate bond. And if the ***tumtum*** died, one of the brothers of the ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* with the wife of the ***tumtum***, or enters into levirate marriage with the wife of the ***tumtum***, in case the ***tumtum*** was a male. And it is taught in another *baraita*: The wife of a ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* and does not enter into levirate marriage. With regard to these two *baraitot*, the Sages assumed that everyone holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who says: **A eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, i.e., one who was entirely lacking in sexual capacity from birth, does not perform *ḥalitza* and does not enter into levirate marriage with his sister-in-law, as he is not included in the mitzva of levirate marriage. Likewise, if he died his brothers do not perform *ḥalitza* with his wife, and they may not enter into levirate marriage with her, as she is forbidden to them as a brother's wife who does not require levirate marriage. Based on this assumption, the Gemara suggests: What, is it not that the two *baraitot* disagree about this, that the one who says that a ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* and one of the brothers performs *ḥalitza* with the wife of the ***tumtum*** or enters into levirate marriage with the wife of the ***tumtum*** holds that we do not say that since this ***tumtum*** has changed from an average person, he might also have changed in that he is a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and therefore the brothers would be prohibited from entering into levirate marriage with the wife? Rather, if the ***tumtum*** is a male, it is assumed that he is capable of fathering children, and consequently his wife requires levirate marriage. And the one who says that the wife of a ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* and does not enter into levirate marriage maintains that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, i.e., the possibility that he might be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** is considered, and therefore his wife may not enter into levirate marriage. The Gemara responds: No; everyone agrees that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, and there is a concern that he might be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Rather, the difference between the rulings is that this *baraita*, which permits the wife of the ***tumtum*** to enter levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who disagrees with Rabbi Akiva and maintains that levirate marriage may be performed with the wife of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and that *baraita*, which prohibits levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, that the brothers of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** do not enter into levirate marriage with the wife of the ***tumtum***. The Gemara asks: And who is the *tanna* who holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva that the wife of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** does not require levirate marriage, and yet he maintains that the wife of a ***tumtum*** must perform *ḥalitza*? If we say it is Rabbi Yehuda, this cannot be, as in his opinion even if the genitals of a ***tumtum*** were revealed and he was found to be a male, he deems him like a definite **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and therefore his wife does not require *ḥalitza* at all. As we learned in a mishna (*Yevamot* 81a) that Rabbi Yehuda says: With regard to a ***tumtum*** who was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was

found to be a male, he must not perform *ḥalitza*, because he is treated like a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Just as this ***tumtum*** does not perform *ḥalitza*, so too, his widow does not require *ḥalitza*. Rather, it is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that if a ***tumtum*** was torn open and he was found to be a male, he is considered as a matter of uncertainty to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** and consequently his wife requires *ḥalitza*. As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: A ***tumtum*** does not perform *ḥalitza* with the wife of his late, childless brother if there are other brothers to perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps the skin covering his genitals will be torn open and he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and the widow would not be released from the levirate bond by his *ḥalitza*. According to this opinion, it is not certain that a ***tumtum*** would be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. With regard to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, the Gemara asks: Why does this individual not perform *ḥalitza* due only to the possibility that he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**? Is that to say that every ***tumtum*** whose skin was torn is found to be a male and is not found to be a female? The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, said his opinion in the formulation of: Perhaps, which includes multiple uncertainties: A ***tumtum*** must not perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a female, who can certainly not perform *ḥalitza*. Alternatively, if he is found to be a male, he may also not perform *ḥalitza*, since perhaps he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. The Gemara asks: Since both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, agree that a ***tumtum*** may not perform *ḥalitza* for his brother's wife, what is the practical difference between their opinions?"

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41b.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41b:3-42b:18)

(203, 204) "With regard to an animal that copulated with a person, or an animal that was the object of bestiality, or an animal that was set aside for idol worship, or one that was worshipped as a deity, or one that was given as payment to a prostitute or as the price of a dog, or a ***tumtum***, i.e., an animal whose **sexual organs are indeterminate, or a hermaphrodite**, i.e., an animal **displaying sexual organs of both sexes**, all of these enter the pen to be tithed despite the fact that they are disqualified from being brought as offerings. Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: A ***tumtum*** **and a hermaphrodite** do not enter the pen to be tithed."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.57a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 57a:9)

(205, 206, 207, 208) “Finally, with regard to an animal that is **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite,** the *tanna* holds that it is uncertain whether it is male or female, not a creature unto itself, and therefore a ***tumtum*** is also subject to the tithe. The *baraita* states that Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: **A *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** do not enter the pen to be tithed. The Gemara explains: He holds that the case of an animal that is **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite** involves an uncertainty, and the Merciful One excluded cases of uncertainty with regard to sacrificial animals. Only a definite male or a definite female is fit to be sacrificed on the altar, but not **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.57a.15?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 57a:15-16)

(209) “A ***tumtum***, whose sexual organs are concealed, and a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, vow, and are the object of a vow, and take vows of valuation, but they are not valuated. Consequently, if one says, with regard to a ***tumtum***: The valuation of so-and-so is incumbent upon me to donate to the Temple treasury, he is not obligated to pay anything, as only a definite male or a definite female are valuated.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.2a.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 2a:2)

(210) “If one were to suggest that this serves to add **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite,** that cannot be correct, as they are explicitly taught in the mishna itself.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.2a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 2a:9)

(211) “Rabbi Yehuda deems a minor fit, but deems a woman and **a hermaphrodite, who has both male and female characteristics**, unfit.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.3a.14?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 3a:14)

(212) “One can argue that so too, anyone who is included in the *halakha* of valuations is included in the ram of the guilt offering. Therefore, **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, who are not included in the *halakha* of valuations, as stated in the mishna, should also not be included in the ram of the guilt offering.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.4a.14?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 4a:14)

(213, 214, 215, 216, 217, 218, 219) “A *baraita* teaches that the apparently superfluous phrase: “Then your valuation shall be” (Leviticus 27:3), serves to include **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** in the *halakha* of assessments, despite the fact that they are not included in the *halakha* of valuations. If one assesses **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, he is obligated to give that assessment. The *baraita* explains that one might have thought that since the verse states: “A vow of persons to the Lord, according to your valuation,” anyone who is included in the category of valuations is also included in the category of assessments, but anyone who is not included in the category of valuations is also not included in the category of assessments. Therefore, the verse states: “Then your valuation shall be,” to include **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** in the *halakha* of assessment. The *baraita* continues: This *halakha*, that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are not included in valuation, is derived from the term: “The male” (Leviticus 27:3). The definite article teaches that this *halakha* applies specifically to a male, and not to **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**. One might have thought that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** should not be valuated by the valuation of a man, but they should be valuated by the valuation of a woman. Therefore, the verse states: “Then your valuation shall be for the male…and if it be a female” (Leviticus 27:3–4). This teaches that valuation applies only to a definite male or a definite female, but not to **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, who are categorized as neither male nor female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.4b.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 4b:4-5)

(220, 221, 222, 223) “The *baraita* also teaches that the phrase: “Then your valuation shall be” (Leviticus 27:2), serves to include **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** in the *halakha* of assessments, despite the fact that they are not included in the *halakha* of valuations. The Gemara asks: Why do I need a verse to include them in the *halakha* of assessments? Even let this be considered only like the assessment of a tree; were one to say: The assessment of that tree is incumbent upon me, is he not obligated to give its assessment? Rava said: The verse serves to say that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are assessed by the significance of the body part that one specified. If one vowed to give a vital part of his body, he is not merely obligated to pay the value of that organ but must give the value of his entire body. As it might enter your mind to say that since it is written in the verse: “A vow of persons to the Lord, according to your valuation,” a person who is valuated is juxtaposed to one who is the object of a vow of assessments. Therefore, anyone who is included in the category of valuations is also included in the *halakha* of being assessed by the significance of the body part that he specifies. But anyone who is not included in the category of valuations, such as **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, is not included in the *halakha* of being assessed by the significance of the body part that he specifies. Therefore, the verse teaches that although **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are not included in valuations, they are nevertheless included in the *halakha* of being assessed by the significance of the body part in question.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.4b.21?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 4b:21-23)

(224) “As the mishna teaches (2a): **A *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** vow, are the object of a vow, and take vows of valuation, but they are not valuated.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.5b.13?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 5b:13)

(225) “By contrast, Rabbi Yehuda’s explanation is reasonable, in that he adduces proof for his *halakha* from the case of a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, as even though they possess the presumed mental competence to make a commitment, nevertheless the Merciful One excludes them from being valuated.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.5b.16?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 5b:16)

(226) “It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and an animal whose **sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*]**, and an animal that is a **hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]** are neither sacred nor do they sanctify another animal.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.11a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 11a:9)

(227, 228) “The Gemara cites another version of the above discussion, which cites the continuation of Rabbi Meir’s statement: But with regard to an animal born of diverse kinds, and **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite**, you find that they can be consecrated only when they are offspring of sacrificial animals, i.e., a consecrated animal impregnated by an animal of a different species, or whose fetus was **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.11a.12?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 11a:12)

(229) “Rabbi Elazar says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and a ***tumtum*** animal, and a **hermaphrodite** animal are not sacred through consecration, and if they were sacred beforehand, e.g., one consecrated an animal and it subsequently became a *tereifa*, they do not sanctify non-sacred animals by means of substitution.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.17a.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 17a:2)

(230, 231, 232, 233) “The mishna taught that Rabbi Elazar says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and a ***tumtum*** animal, and a hermaphrodite animal, are neither sacred through consecration nor do they sanctify non-sacred animals by means of substitution. Shmuel says in explanation: They are not sanctified by substitution, i.e., if one said that an animal in any of these categories should be a substitute for a sacrificial animal, it does not become sanctified. And the clause that they do not sanctify non-sacred animals means that if one of these types of animal was sanctified and one attempted to render a non-sacred animal a substitute for it, that non-sacred animal does not become sanctified. It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Meir said: But since these animals do not become sanctified, how can it even be suggested that they could sanctify another non-sacred animal? Rather, you find that the ruling of Rabbi Elazar applies only when one sanctifies an animal and afterward it became a *tereifa*, or when one sanctifies a fetus and it emerged from the womb by caesarean section. But with regard to an animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a ***tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite**, you can find this ruling only in a case of the offspring of consecrated female animals, which have sanctity without an act of consecration. And this is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said that the offspring of a consecrated animal renders a non-sacred animal that is exchanged for it consecrated as a substitute. Rav Pappa said: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Elazar? He holds that the *halakhot* of these categories of animal is like that of a non-kosher domesticated animal: Just as a non-kosher domesticated animal is not sacrificed as an offering and inherent sanctity does not rest upon it, so too, these animals in the categories of a *tereifa*, an animal born by caesarean section, **a *tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite** may not be sacrificed as offerings and inherent sanctity does not rest upon them. Rav Pappa said to Rava: But why aren’t animals in these categories compared to a blemished animal, which may not be sacrificed as an offering but nevertheless inherent sanctity does rest upon it? Rava said to Rav Pappa in response: Although a blemished animal is not sacrificed on the altar, another animal of its same type, i.e., an unblemished animal, is sacrificed as an offering. By contrast, an animal born by caesarean section, **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite** may never be sacrificed. Rav Pappa said to Rava: If so, what will you say about a *tereifa*, as other animals of its type are sacrificed. According to your explanation, why doesn’t inherent sanctity rest upon a *tereifa*? Rather, Rava retracts his previous answer and instead says: The *halakhot* of animals in these categories are like those of a non-kosher domesticated animal, in the following manner: Just as the category of a non-kosher domesticated animal is an inherent disqualification, and such an animal cannot be sanctified or render another animal sanctified, so too the same applies to any other category of animal that is an inherent disqualification, such as a *tereifa*, an animal born by caesarean section, **a *tumtum* animal, and a hermaphrodite**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.17a.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 14a:10-14)

(234) “Come and hear, as Rabbi Elazar says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and a ***tumtum*** animal, and a **hermaphrodite** animal are not sacred through consecration and they do not sanctify non-sacred animals by means of substitution.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.17a.21?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 17a:21)

(235) “If the animal gave birth to a ***tumtum***, **whose gender is unknown**, or a **hermaphrodite, which has both male and female sexual organs**, both of which are unfit for sacrifice, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: They are not imbued with sanctity.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.24b.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 24b:3)

(236) “The mishna teaches: If the animal gave birth to **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite,** Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: They are not imbued with sanctity.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.24b.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 24b:10)

(237) “Rabbi Judah says a minor is eligible, but disqualifies a woman and a hermaphrodite.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Parah.5.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah Parah 5:4)

(238) “All are eligible to sprinkle, except a tumtum, a hermaphrodite, a woman, and a child that is without understanding.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Parah.12.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah Parah 12:10)

(239, 240, 241, 242) “A woman who discharges or gives birth to a **tumtum**, **whose sexual organs are obscured**, or to a **hermaphrodite [ve’androginos]**, **who has both male and female sexual organs**, shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. She is impure for fourteen days like a woman who gave birth to a female, but blood that she sees thereafter is pure only until forty days after birth, like for a woman who gave birth to a male. In a case where she gave birth to twins, if they are a **tumtum** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. But if the twins are a **tumtum** and a female, or a **hermaphrodite** and a female, she shall observe the periods of purity and impurity established by the Torah for a woman who gives birth to a female alone. Regardless of the status of the **tumtum and the hermaphrodite**, the woman’s seven days of impurity and her succeeding thirty-three days of purity are subsumed in the fourteen days of impurity and sixty-six days of purity for a female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Niddah.3.5?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Niddah 3:5)

(243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261) “MISHNA: A woman who discharges or gives birth to a ***tumtum*****, whose sexual organs are obscured, or to a hermaphrodite [*****ve’androginos*****], who has both male and female sexual organs**, shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. She is impure for fourteen days like a woman who gave birth to a female, but blood that she sees thereafter is pure only until forty days after birth, like for a woman who gave birth to a male. In a case where she gave birth to twins, if they are a ***tumtum*** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. But if the twins are a ***tumtum*** and a female, or a **hermaphrodite** and a female, she shall observe the periods of purity and impurity established by the Torah for a woman who gives birth to a female alone. Regardless of the status of the ***tumtum*** and the **hermaphrodite**, the woman’s seven days of impurity and her succeeding thirty-three days of purity are subsumed in the fourteen days of impurity and sixty-six days of purity for a female. If the fetus emerged in pieces, or if it emerged reversed, i.e., feetfirst rather than headfirst, when most of its limbs emerge, its status is like that of a child born, with regard to the impurity of a woman after childbirth. If the fetus emerged in the usual manner, headfirst, it is not considered born until most of its head emerges. And what is considered most of its head? It is from when its forehead emerges. GEMARA: The Gemara asks: Now that with regard to a woman who gives birth to a ***tumtum*** alone, or a **hermaphrodite** alone, the mishna states that she shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female, as the sex of the offspring is uncertain, is it necessary for the mishna to rule that if a woman gives birth to twins, a ***tumtum*** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth to both a male and a female? The Gemara answers: It was necessary for the mishna to state this *halakha*, lest you say that since Rabbi Yitzḥak says that the sex of a fetus is determined at the moment of conception, in that if the woman emits seed first she gives birth to a male, and if the man emits seed first she gives birth to a female, therefore one might say that since this offspring that was born with the ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is male, that ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is also male. Consequently, the mishna teaches us that the woman shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth to a female as well, as one can say that perhaps both the

man and the woman emitted seed at the same time, which would mean that this offspring is male and that ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is female. Rav Naḥman says that Rav says: In the case of a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** who saw a white gonorrhea-like discharge [*ziva*], for which a man is impure, or who emitted a red discharge that had the appearance of menstrual blood, for which a woman is impure, if they entered the Temple they are not liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, as perhaps they are pure, in accordance with their true sex. And if they touched *teruma* after such a discharge, one does not burn the *teruma* due to their contact, as although impure *teruma* must be burned, the impurity in this case is uncertain. If a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** saw white *ziva* and red blood as one, i.e., they emitted both *ziva* and blood and are therefore impure regardless of their sex, they are still not liable for entering the Temple, but one does burn *teruma* due to their contact. The reason they are not liable for entering the Temple, despite the fact that they are definitely impure, is that it is stated: ‘Both male and female you shall send out, out of the camp you shall send them, so that they not impurify their camp, in the midst of which I dwell’ (Numbers 5:3). It is derived from the verse that only a definite male or a definite female is liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the following *baraita* supports the opinion of Rav: In the case of a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** who saw white *ziva* or red blood, they are not liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, and if they touch *teruma*, one does not burn the *teruma* due to their contact. If they saw white *ziva* and red blood as one, i.e., they emitted both *ziva* and blood, they are still not liable for entering the Temple, but one burns *teruma* due to their contact. The Gemara reasons: What is the reason that they are not liable for entering the Temple despite the fact that they are definitely impure? Is it not because it is stated in the verse: ‘Both male and female you shall send out,’ from which it is derived that only a definite male or a definite female could be liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**? Ulla says: No, Rav’s opinion cannot be proved from this *baraita*, as in accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. As we learned in a mishna (*Shevuot* 14b) that Rabbi Eliezer says: With regard to the sliding-scale offering the verse states: ‘Or if a person touches any impure thing…or the carcass of a non-kosher creeping animal, and it is hidden from him’ (Leviticus 5:2). A precise reading of this verse indicates that if one has a lapse of awareness that he contracted ritual impurity by touching a carcass of a creeping animal, he is liable to bring a sliding-scale offering for defiling the Temple or the sacrificial food, but he is not liable to bring such an offering for a lapse of awareness that he is entering the Temple or partaking of sacrificial food. Rabbi Akiva says that it is derived from the phrase: ‘And it is hidden from him, so that he is impure’ (Leviticus 5:2), that for a lapse of awareness that one had contracted ritual impurity, he is liable to bring a sliding-scale offering, but he is not liable to bring an offering for a lapse of awareness that he is entering the Temple or partaking of sacrificial food. And we say with regard to this mishna: What is the difference between the opinions of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva? They are apparently stating the same *halakha*. And Ḥizkiyya says: There is a practical difference between them in a case where one initially knew that he had contracted ritual impurity, but he did not know whether the impurity was contracted from a carcass of a creeping animal or from the carcass of an unslaughtered animal. As Rabbi Eliezer holds that for one to be liable to bring an offering, we require that he initially know whether he contracted impurity from a carcass of a creeping animal or whether he contracted impurity from an unslaughtered animal carcass, and if he never knew this, he does not bring an offering. And Rabbi Akiva holds that for him to be liable to bring an offering, we do not require that

he know this detail, since he knows in general terms that he contracted impurity. The Gemara infers: Doesn't Rabbi Eliezer say there, in that mishna, that we require one to bring an offering for entering the Temple in a state of impurity only if he knew initially whether he contracted impurity from a carcass of a creeping animal or whether he contracted impurity from an unslaughtered animal carcass? Here, too, with regard to a **hermaphrodite** or a ***tumtum*** who emitted both *ziva* and blood, they are not obligated to bring an offering according to Rabbi Eliezer, as we require one to bring an offering only if he knew whether he became impure due to the white *ziva* he emitted or whether he became impure due to the red blood he emitted. But according to Rabbi Akiva, who said that one is obligated to bring an offering due to his initial knowledge of his impurity even if he did not know the exact cause of his impurity, here too, in the case of a **hermaphrodite** or a ***tumtum*** who emitted both *ziva* and blood, he is obligated to bring an offering due to his initial knowledge of his impurity, despite the fact that he does not know whether he is impure due to the blood or the *ziva*. The Gemara asks: And according to Rav, who holds that an impure ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is not liable for entering the Temple but that any *teruma* that he touches is burned, what is different with regard to entering the Temple, for which he is not liable? The reason it is different is that it is written: 'Both male and female you shall send out,' from which it is derived that a definite male or a definite female is liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. If so, we should not burn *teruma* that he touches either, as it is written in a verse dealing with these types of impurity: 'This is the law of the *zav,* and of one from whom the flow of semen emerges, so that he is thereby impure; and of her that is sick with her menstrual status, and they who have an issue, whether a male or a female' (Leviticus 15:32–33). It can similarly be derived from this verse that these types of impurity apply only to a definite male or a definite female, but not to a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.28a.12?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 28a:12)

(262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272) "With regard to Rav's *halakha* that the prohibition of entering the Temple in a state of ritual impurity does not apply to one who is a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**, the Gemara asks: If so, then even when they become impure with other types of impurity, in addition to the impurity of a *zav* or a menstruating woman, a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** should likewise not be sent out of the Temple, as the passage from which a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** are excluded is also referring to other types of impurity: 'That they put out of the camp every leper, and every one that has an issue, and whatever is impure by the dead' (Numbers 5:2). The Gemara answers: The next verse states: 'Both male,' which is referring to impurity caused by a substance that is emitted from the male organ, i.e., *ziva*. The Gemara raises a difficulty with regard to Rav's derivation: And is it correct that anywhere that the phrase "both male and female" is written in the Torah, this comes to exclude a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite**? But isn't a similar expression stated with regard to valuations, as it is written: "For the male…fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary. And if she is a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekels" (Leviticus 27:3–4). And it is taught in a *baraita* that it is derived from the term "the male": But not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. One might have thought that a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite** shall not be valuated according to the valuation of a man, which is fifty shekels, but shall be valuated according to the valuation of a woman, which is thirty shekels. Therefore, the

verse states: “The male,” and the following verse states: “And if she is a female,” indicating that these *halakhot* apply only to a definite male or a definite female, but not to a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. The Gemara explains the difficulty: The reason a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** are excluded is that it is written: “The male…and if she is a female,” which indicates that if the verse had written: Male and female, without the superfluous words “the” and “if,” it would not have been derived that the verse excludes a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite**. This apparently contradicts the opinion of Rav, who excludes a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** from the prohibition of entering the Temple in a state of impurity merely due to the phrase: “Male and female” (Numbers 5:3). The Gemara answers: In that verse with regard to valuations, the words “male” and “female” are themselves necessary in order to differentiate between the valuation of a man and the valuation of a woman. Therefore, it could not have been derived from that verse that a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** are excluded from the *halakha* of valuations, were it not for the superfluous words ‘the’ and ‘if’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.28b.16?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 28b:16-29a:1)

(273, 274, 275) “GEMARA: The Sages taught the following *baraita*: All are obligated to sound the *shofar*: Priests, Levites, and ordinary Israelites; converts; freed slaves; a ***tumtum***, i.e., one whose sexual organs from birth are concealed or are so undeveloped that it is impossible to determine whether the individual is male or female; a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, i.e., one with **both male and female reproductive organs**; and a half-slave, half-freeman. A ***tumtum*** who sounds the *shofar* cannot discharge the obligation of one of his kind, i.e., a fellow ***tumtum***, since men are bound by the obligation, whereas women are not, and it is possible that the sounder is female and the hearer is male, nor can he discharge the obligation of one who is not of his kind, an ordinary man or woman. A **hermaphrodite** can discharge the obligation of one of his kind, a fellow **hermaphrodite**, since if the sounder is treated as a female, the hearer is also considered a female, but he cannot discharge the obligation of one who is not of his kind.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Rosh_Hashanah.29a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Rosh Hashanah 29a:9-10)

275 total mentions

Androgynous

Note: Depending on the version it can say Androgynous or Hermaphrodite, Sefaria sometimes uses both terms so I decided to make a category for both, and I included non-specific terms like “male and female” in both categories.

(1, 2) “The two supernal letters which rise aloft are intertwined the one within the other, expressing the union of mercy and severity. Hence they are two, and are of the upper world, symbolising the male principle. On the other hand, the one that ascended from below and joined them symbolises the female principle, and thus is embraced by the two, in the same way as the female is embraced by two arms, the right and the left, so that **a unity is formed which is both male and female**. For when the world was created it was the supernal letters that brought into being all the works of the lower world, literally after their own pattern. Hence, whoever has a knowledge of them and is observant of them is beloved both on high and below. R. Simeon said: ‘All these letters consist of **male and female merging together into one union**, symbolical of the upper waters and the lower waters, which also form one union. This is the type of perfect unity’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayetzei.26.260?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayetzei 26:260-261)

(3) “’Male and female he created them’ is a reference to the phylactery of the head and the phylactery of the hand, which together make one whole.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Introduction.30.243?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Introduction 30:243)

(4) “Therefore it says: ‘See now that I, I am he, and Elohim is not with me’, of which it should take counsel, since it has no colleague and no partner, nor even number, for **there is a ‘one’ which connotes combination, such as male and female**, of whom it is written, ‘for I have called him one’ (Is. 51, 2);”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.15.171?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 15:171)

(5) “The words ‘and (ve-eth) the earth’ indicate **the union of male and female**, which were traced with individual letters, and the ‘life of the king’ which flowed from the heavens, the heavens pouring them forth to maintain the earth and all its denizens.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.30.305?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 30:305)

(6) “Further, the two words eth hashamaim (the heavens) signify **the fitting union of male and female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.35.343?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 35:343)

(7) “Similarly we can interpret the text ‘the heavens and the earth’ to mean that the higher Shekinah and the lower Shekinah **will be joined in the union of male and female**;”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.86.246?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 86:246)

(8) “**For where male and female are not found together, he is eliminated** and only daleth is left (hence in Deut. 22, 15, the word na’ar is used for “maiden” instead of na’arah, because she is not united with the male).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.86.261?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 86:261)

(9) “For we have learnt that when God sends souls into the world they are **formed into pairs of male and female, and thus united**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Lech_Lecha.32.348?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 32:348)

(10) “There are thus two grades, which are, however, really one with two aspects, **male and female, in fitting union.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Toldot.14.109?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Toldot 14:109)

(11) “AND THEY SAID TO HIM: in the word elau (to him) there are dots over the letters aleph, yod, and vau, which spell out the word ayo (where is he?). This is a reference to the Holy One who is above. Again, the word thus formed ayo is followed by the word ayeh (where?), which is a feminine form of the same, to emphasise **the bond of union between the male and the female, which is the secret of true faith.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayera.6.98?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayera 6:98)

(12) “AND GOD SAID, LET THE WATERS FLOW: The word flow (yikavvu) implies that they were to go in a line (kav) so as to take a straight path. For from the first mystic point the Whole issues in secret, until it reaches and is gathered in to the supernal Palace, and from there it issues in a straight line to the other grades, until it comes to that place which **collects the whole in a union of male and female**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.7.66?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 7:1)

(13, 14) “Up to this point the words ‘The Lord our God the Lord’ (Tetragrammaton Elohenu Tetragrammaton) represent three grades corresponding to this deep mystery of Bereshith bara Elohim. Bereshith represents the primordial mystery. Bara represents the mysterious source from which the whole expanded. Elohim represents the force which sustains all below. The words eth hashammaim indicate that **the two latter are on no account to be separated, and are male and female together.** The word eth consists of the letters aleph and tau, which include between them all the letters, as being the first and last of the alphabet. Afterwards he was added, so that all the letters should be attached to he, and this gave the name attah (Thou); hence we read ‘and Thou (ve-attah) keepest all of them alive’ (Neh. 9, 6). Eth again alludes to Adonai (Lord), who is so called. Hashammaim is Tetragrammaton in its higher signification. The next word, ve-eth, **indicates the firm union of male and female**;”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.2.10?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar Bereshit 2:10-13)

(15) “A tumtum and an androgynous are obligated in all positive commandments because of the doubt [about their status].”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Fringes.3.9?lang=en: Mishneh Torah, Fringes 3:9

)

(16) “An androgynous (i.e., a hermaphrodite) is in some ways like a man and in some ways like a woman. And in some ways he is like both a man and a woman, and in some ways he is like neither a man nor a woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Tosefta_Bikkurim.2.3?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Tosefta Bikkurim 2:2)

(17) “If a daughter, a ***tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite [*androginos*]** is born to him, he is not a nazirite, since a son was not born to him. However, if he says: I am hereby a nazirite when I will have a child, then even if a daughter, a ***tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite** is born to him, he is a nazirite.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Nazir.12b.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Nazir 12b:10)

(18) “A person who **possesses both a male sexual organ and a female sexual organ is called an androgynous**. There is doubt whether such a person should be classified as a male or as a female; there is no physical sign that can ever enable such a distinction to be made.
A person who possesses neither a male sexual organ nor a female sexual organ, but instead, his genital area is a solid mass, is called a **tumtum**. There is also doubt with regard [to this person's status]. If an operation is carried out and a male [organ is revealed], he is definitely considered to be a male. If a female [organ is revealed], she is definitely considered to be a female.
When a **tumtum** or an androgynous reaches the age of twelve years and one day, they are assumed to be adults. Whenever these terms are mentioned, the intent is individuals of this age.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Marriage.2.24?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Mishneh Torah, Marriage 2:24-25)

(19) “He said: ‘The aleph of the word vayikra (and he called) is written small in the scroll, to show that this calling was not a perfect one, because it was only in the Tabernacle and in a strange land, perfection being only found in the Holy Land. Further, in the Tabernacle there was only the Shekinah, but in the land there was **the complete union of Male and Female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayechi.62.611?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayechi 62:611-612)

(20) “Observe that it has been said before that the desire of the male towards the female forms a soul, and the desire of **the female towards the male rises upwards to unite with the soul and form one being**. The woman is thus the body which is destined for the association of the soul that is derived from the male. These bodies, then, are destined to rise first, as we said already, and then all the others in the other lands will be raised in a complete state and will be renewed with the renewal of the moon, and the world will be restored to its primeval state, in allusion to which it is written: ‘Let the Lord rejoice in his works’ (Ps. 104, 31).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayeshev.5.62?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayeshev 5:62-63)

(21) “R. Jose said: ‘The word ‘equity’ (mesharim, lit. equities) in the above quoted verse indicates that the **Cherubim were male and female**.’ R. Isaac said: ‘From this we learn that where there is no **union of male and female men** are not worthy to behold the divine presence’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Achrei_Mot.7.56?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Achrei Mot 7:56-8:57)

(22) “Observe that the function of the priests and Levites is to unite the Left with the Right. Said R. Hizkiah: That is so, but I have been told that one rouses the Left and the other the Right, because **the union of male and female** is only brought about by Left and Right, as it says: ‘O that his left hand were under my head, and his right hand should embrace me’ (S. S. 2, 6). Then male and female are united, and there is mutual desire and worlds are blessed and upper and lower rejoice.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayechi.69.718?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayechi 69:718)

(23) “Said R. Judah: It is written: ‘This thy stature is like to a palm tree’ (S.S. 7, 8)..What love, indeed, has the Holy One bestowed upon the Community of Israel in that He never separates Himself from her, but is perpetually and perfectly united with her, even as a palm tree in which **male and female are one in complete and continual union!**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Mishpatim.29.576?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Mishpatim 29:576)

(24) “It is the mystery of the complete Man, Male and Female, and is the secret of the whole Faith.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Terumah.24.246?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Terumah 24:246)

(25) “R. Eleazar said: This is not so. All at first comprise both male and female, and they are separated afterwards.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.6.25?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 6:25)

(26, 27) “So in the exposition of the verse, ‘Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God, the Lord is one’ we have learnt that ‘one’ signifies the Community of Israel who clings to the Holy One, blessed be He, since, as Rabbi Simeon said, **the union of male and female is called “one”**, the Holy One, blessed be He, being called “one” only in the place where the Female also is, since the male without the female is called half the body, and half is not one. **When, however, the two halves are united, they become one body and are called one**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.16.100?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 16:100-101)

(28, 29) “Observe that all spirits are **compounded of male and female**, and when they go forth into the world they go forth as **both male and female**, and afterwards the two elements are separated. If a man is worthy they are afterwards united, and it is then that he truly meets his mate and there is a perfect union both in spirit and flesh. Hence it is written here: ‘When a woman conceives seed and bears a male’, and not ‘male and female together’, since on account of the ways of the world they are not united (at birth) as they were when they issued from on high, because the first man and his mate sinned before God.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.5.22?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 5:22)

(30, 31) “Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: **When the Holy One blessed be He created Adam the first man, He created him androgynous.** That is what is written: “He created them male and female” (Genesis 5:2). Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥman said: When the Holy One blessed be He created Adam the first man, **He created him with two faces**, and [subsequently] He sawed him in two and made [for] him two backs, a back here and a back there. They raised an objection to him: But is it not written: “He took one of his ribs [tzalotav] … [and the Lord God built the rib that He took from the man into a woman]”? (Genesis 2:21–22). He said to them: [It means that He took] **one of his two sides**, as it says: “And for the tzela of the Tabernacle” (Exodus 26:20), which we translate: “And for the side of the Tabernacle...”.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bereshit_Rabbah.8.1?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Bereshit Rabbah 8:1)

(32, 33) “Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥman said: **When the Holy One blessed be He created Adam the first man, He created him androgynous**. Reish Lakish said: When he was created, **he was created with two faces**. [God] sawed him, and two backs were formed, **a back for the male and a back for the female**. They raised an objection to him: “He took one of his ribs [mitzalotav]…[the Lord God built the rib that He took from the man into a woman]” (Genesis 2:21). He said to them: It was one of his sides, as it is written: “For the [second] side [ultzela] of the Tabernacle” (Exodus 26:20).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Vayikra_Rabbah.14.1?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Vayikra Rabbah 14:1)

(34, 35) “I have written on a number of occasions that man is the purpose of Creation, that he was created in the image and likeness of G–d, and that just as **Adam originally had two faces to indicate the equality of man and woman**, so also man's body and soul respectively used to be perfect and both were sanctified to their G–d. **Woman subsequently was separated from Adam** in order to become his helpmate (partner), to enable them to unite truly and to become "one flesh" (Genesis 2:24).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shenei_Luchot_HaBerit%2C_Torah_Shebikhtav%2C_Ki_Teitzei%2C_Torah_Ohr.1?lang=en: Shenei Luchot HaBerit, Torah Shebikhtav, Ki Teitzei, Torah Ohr 1)

(36) “מצלעותיו OF HIS RIBS — The word means of his sides, similar to (Exodus 26:20) ולצלע המשכן “and for the second side of the tabernacle”; this has a bearing upon what they (the Sages) say, **(Eruvin 18a): They were created with two faces (sides).**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Rashi_on_Genesis.2.21.1?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Rashi on Genesis 2:21:1)

(37) “Listen to this. All the souls in the world, which are the fruit of the handiwork of the Almighty, are all mystically one, but when they descend to this world they are separated into male and female, though these are still conjoined.”
(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Lech_Lecha.21.204?lang=en: Zohar, Lech Lecha 21:204)

(38) “And this is the mystery of the creation of the first man, who was created with two faces (male and female combined).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Introduction.6.26?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Introduction 6:26)

(39, 40) “The colleagues here interrupted and said, ‘Rabbi, Rabbi, is there such a division between Father and Mother that from the side of the Father Man has been formed in the way of emanation, and from the side of the Mother in the way of creation?’ He replied, ‘My friends, it is not so, since the **Man of emanation was both male and female**, from the side of both Father and Mother, and that is why it says, ‘And God said, Let there be light, and there was light’: ‘let there be light’ from the side of the Father, ‘and there was light’ from the side of the Mother; and this is **the man ‘of two faces’**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.14.165?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 14:165)

(41, 42, 43, 44) “FRUIT TREE BEARING FRUIT. One degree above another, these **combining male and female**. (…) The words ‘fruit tree bearing fruit’ indicate the **form of male and female in combination**. Their faces are ‘like the face of a man’ (Ezek. 1, 10), but they are not like the Cherubim, having large faces covered with beards, whereas the Cherubim have little faces like those of tender children. All forms are comprised in these, because they are ‘large faces’. On them are traced forms like the tracings of the Divine Name on the four cardinal points, East, West, North, and South. Michael is imprinted on the South, and all faces are turned towards him, viz. ‘the face of a man… the face of a lion… the face of an ox… the face of an eagle’ (Ibid.). **“Man” implies the union of male and female, without which the name ‘man’ (Adam) is not applied**. By him are formed the figures of the chariot of God, as it is written: ‘(On) the chariot of God are myriads of thousands of Shin’an (angels)’ (Ps. 68, 15): the word SHiN’AN expresses by means of its initials all the figures, the Shin standing for Shor (ox), the Nun for Nesher (eagle), and the Aleph for Aryeh (lion), and the final Nun representing by its shape man, who walks erect, and who **mystically combines male and female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.8.80?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 8:80-83)

(45) “When these three letters descended below, together in their complete form, the name **Adam was found to comprise male and female**. The female was attached to the side of the male until God cast him into a deep slumber, during which he lay on the site of the Temple. God then sawed her off from him and adorned her like a bride and brought her to him, as it is written, ‘And he took one of his sides and closed up the place with flesh.’ (Gen. 2, 21).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.41.414?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 41:414-416)

(46, 47) “‘Let us make man’: the word **adam (man) implies male and female**, created wholly through the supernal and holy Wisdom. ‘In our image, after our likeness’: **the two being combined**, so that man should be unique in the world and ruler over all.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.73.172?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 73:172)

(48) “This is to indicate that when the world was finished the male and female were united so as to form a single whole-he’ with ‘sixth’, which is the foundation.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.74.175?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 74:175)

(49) “THE MAN: as we have explained, male and female, together and not separated, so as to turn face to face.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.81.209?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 81:209)

(50, 51, 52, 53) “‘Male and female he created them.’ From this we learn that **every figure which does not comprise male and female elements is not a true and proper figure**, and so we have laid down in the esoteric teaching of our Mishnah. Observe this. **God does not place His abode in any place where male and female are not found together**, nor are blessings found save in such a place, as it is written, AND HE BLESSED THEM AND CALLED THEIR NAME MAN ON THE DAY THAT THEY WERE CREATED: note that it says them and their name, and not him and his name. **The male is not even called man till he is united with the female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.95.368?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 95:368-369)

(54) “R. Isaac said: ‘Adam was created as a double personality (male and female), as previously explained.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Beshalach.16.233?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Beshalach 16:233)

(55, 56) “Said R. Abba: **The first man consisted of male and female**, for it says: ‘Let us make man in our image after our likeness’ (Ibid. 1, 26), which indicates that male and female were originally created as one and separated afterwards.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Beshalach.16.238?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Beshalach 16:238)

(57, 58, 59, 60) “There are two grades, male and female. For all the souls and spirits that enter human beings are alluded to in the words ‘generations of man (Adam)’, for they all issue from the ‘Righteous One’, and this is the ‘watering of the river that went out of Eden to water the garden’ (Gen. 2, 10). There is also another, a lower ‘Adam’, alluded to in the words, ‘on the day that God created man (Adam)’, in the same verse. In regard to the upper **Adam, the union of male and female** is at first only distantly alluded to in the words ‘this is the book’, but after they produced offspring they are called openly ‘Adam’. Then it is said that God made man in the ‘likeness’ of God. By the word ‘likeness’ we are to understand a kind of mirror in which images appear momentarily and then pass away. According to another explanation, the word ‘likeness’ refers to **the union of male and female organs**: and so the Master affirmed. In regard to the upper **Adam, the union of male and female** is at first only distantly alluded to in the words ‘this is the book’, but after they produced offspring they are called openly ‘Adam’. Then it is said that God made man in the ‘likeness’ of God. By the word ‘likeness’ we are to understand a kind of mirror in which images appear momentarily and then pass away. According to another explanation, the word ‘likeness’ refers to **the union of male and female organs**: and so the Master affirmed.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Yitro.4.63?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Yitro 4:63-67)

(61) “Man was in the Divine mind, in the inner mystery. God created him, male and female in one, ‘in the image of God’, symbolized by the palm.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Yitro.11.170?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Yitro 11:170)

(62) “Observe that at the creation of Adam the Holy One, blessed be He, made him male and female together, female behind and male before.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Pekudei.21.202?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Pekudei 21:202)

(63) “And therefore ‘God formed man dust from the ground’, etc. (Gen. 2, 7), that he might join one with the other and himself be perfect. And therefore **God created man male and female** that he might be perfect.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.13.94?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 13:94)

(64) “For when God created man, He created him without flaw, as it is written, ‘God made man upright’ (yashar, lit. straight) (Eccles. 7, 20). The word **‘man’ (adam) means male and female, the female being included in the male**, and hence it says ‘upright’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.44.315?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 44:315)

(65) “The word ‘man’ (adam) indicates a combination of male and female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.18.80?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 18:80)

(66) “For since Scripture says ‘And God created man in his own image’, why repeat ‘in the image of God created he him’? But what it signifies is a two-foldness of grades, of **male and female comprised within the man**, which made him a duality of prosopa, so that he was complete in all respects, and he contemplated in wisdom both what was above and what was below.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bamidbar.1.2?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bamidbar 1:2)

(67, 68, 69) “Said R. Judah: ‘But there is a teaching that the term **‘Adam’ signifies the conjunction of male and female**?’ R. Eleazar in reply said: ‘Assuredly so. He who achieves for himself **the union of male and female is called Adam**, and in this way has the fear of sin. He attains, moreover, to the virtue of humility, and even the degree of grace. Contrariwise, he who remains without that union possesses neither fear nor humility nor the state of grace. So Scripture says: ‘For I have said: The world is built by Grace’ (Ibid. 89, 3), to wit, by **Adam, who denotes the union of male and female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Nasso.13.141?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Nasso 13:141)

(70) “Alternatively, this duplication in the language of creation can be explained in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar, as Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, created two faces [*du partzufin*] on **Adam the first man; he was created both male and female in a single body**, as it is stated: ‘You have formed me [*tzartani*] behind and before’ (Psalms 139:5); *tzartani* is derived from the word *tzura* [face]. God formed two faces on a single creation, back and front. It is stated: ‘And the *tzela* which the Lord, God, had taken from the man, He made a woman, and brought her unto the man’ (Genesis 2:22).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Berakhot.61a.5?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Berakhot 61a:5)

(71, 72, 73) “The Gemara suggests: Let us say that they disagree about this: One Sage holds: It was one act of creation with which man was created. And one Sage holds: It was two acts of creation with which man was created. The first opinion, that there was one act of creation, is based on the concept that **man was created with two sides, one male and one female**. There was no additional act of creation. Man and woman were subsequently separated into two independent beings. Therefore, there is no need for the two blessings: Who created mankind, and: Who created mankind in His image. The second opinion is that there were in fact two separate acts of creation. Therefore, it is appropriate to recite two blessings with regard to the creation of mankind. The Gemara rejects that suggestion: No, everyone agrees that it was only one act of creation. However, one Sage holds: It is according to the initial thought that we proceed. And one Sage holds: It is according to the action that we proceed. **God’s initial thought was to create man and woman as separate entities. Ultimately, they were created as one entity**. That explanation is like the following. Rav Yehuda raises a contradiction. In one verse it is written: ‘And God created man in His own image’ (Genesis 1:27), indicating one act of creation, and in another verse it is written: ‘Male and female He created them’ (Genesis 5:2), indicating two acts. How can this apparent contradiction be resolved? Initially, the thought entered God’s mind to create two, but **ultimately only one was actually created**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Ketubot.8a.8?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Ketubot 8a:8-9)

(74) “If there is uncertainty whether or not to circumcise a baby, and likewise in the case of a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]** baby, who possesses **both male and female genitals**, one does not desecrate Shabbat to perform the circumcision, since it is not certain that the circumcision is required. And Rabbi Yehuda permits doing so **for a hermaphrodite** baby.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.134b.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 134b:2)

(75) “The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna in tractate *Para*: Everyone is qualified to sprinkle the purification waters, except for **a person whose sexual organs are concealed [*tumtum*]**, and a **hermaphrodite [*androginus*]**, and a woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yoma.43a.14?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yoma 43a:14)

(76) “All persons become unclean through zivah, even converts, even slaves whether freed or not, a deaf-mute, a person of unsound senses, and a minor, a **eunuch** whether [he had been castrated] by man, or was a **eunuch** from [the time of seeing] the sun. With regard to a **tumtum** and an **androgynous** [person], they place upon him the stringencies for a man and the stringencies for a woman: they defile through blood like a woman, and through eggy [substance] like a man.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Zavim.2.1?lang=en&sbsq=androgynous&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Zavim 2:1)

(77) “The Gemara raises an objection from a different source: A priest who is a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma*, but his wives and slaves may partake of it. A priest who had been circumcised, but subsequently the residual foreskin was drawn forward, and similarly one who was born circumcised, i.e., without a foreskin, may partake of *teruma*. A priest who is a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, possessing both male and female genitals, and was circumcised may partake of *teruma*, as whether he is male or female he is entitled to eat *teruma*, but he may not partake of sacrificial food, which is permitted only to male priests, as he might not be a male. A priest who is a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma* or sacrificial food, as he might be a male, and since **his member is hidden** he cannot be circumcised.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.72a.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 72a:10)

(78) “The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna (*Nidda* 28a): A woman who miscarries **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]** observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth to a male and to a female. **Since it is uncertain whether the fetus is male or female**, the woman must observe the *halakhot* of ritual impurity according to both possibilities. This appears to be a conclusive refutation of the statement of Rav Sherevya that a woman who gives birth to a ***tumtum*** is not rendered impure at all. The Gemara affirms: This is a conclusive refutation.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.127a.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 127a:4)

(79) “And one does not slaughter a ***tumtum***, whose sexual organs are concealed, and a **hermaphrodite [*ve’anderoginos*]**, which **has both male and female sexual organs**, neither in the Temple nor in the rest of the country. Rabbi Shimon says: You have no blemish greater than that, and it may be slaughtered. And the Rabbis say: The halakhic status of a h**ermaphrodite** is not that of a firstborn; rather, its halakhic status is that of a non-sacred animal that may be shorn and utilized for labor.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41a.6?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41a:6)

(80) “A ***tumtum***, whose sexual organs are concealed, and a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, vow, and are the object of a vow, and take vows of valuation, but they are not valuated. Consequently, if one says, with regard to a ***tumtum***: The valuation of so-and-so is incumbent upon me to donate to the Temple treasury, he is not obligated to pay anything, as only a definite male or a definite female are valuated.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.2a.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 2a:2)

(81) “It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and an animal whose **sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*]**, and an animal that is a **hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]** are neither sacred nor do they sanctify another animal.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.11a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 11a:9)

(82) “A woman who discharges or gives birth to a **tumtum**, **whose sexual organs are obscured**, or to a **hermaphrodite [ve’androginos]**, **who has both male and female sexual organs**, shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. She is impure for fourteen days like a woman who gave birth to a female, but blood that she sees thereafter is pure only until forty days after birth, like for a woman who gave birth to a male. In a case where she gave birth to twins, if they are a **tumtum** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. But if the twins are a **tumtum** and a female, or a **hermaphrodite** and a female, she shall observe the periods of purity and impurity established by the Torah for a woman who gives birth to a female alone. Regardless of the status of the **tumtum and the hermaphrodite**, the woman’s seven days of impurity and her succeeding thirty-three days of purity are subsumed in the fourteen days of impurity and sixty-six days of purity for a female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Niddah.3.5?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Niddah 3:5)

(83) “MISHNA: A woman who discharges or gives birth to a ***tumtum*, whose sexual organs are obscured, or to a hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*], who has both male and female sexual organs**, shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. She is impure for fourteen days like a woman who gave birth to a female, but blood that she sees thereafter is pure only until forty days after birth, like for a woman who gave birth to a male. In a case where she gave birth to twins, if they are a ***tumtum*** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. But if the twins are a ***tumtum*** and a female, or a **hermaphrodite** and a female, she shall observe the periods of purity and impurity established by the Torah for a woman who gives birth to a female alone. Regardless of the status of the ***tumtum*** and the **hermaphrodite**, the woman’s seven days of impurity and her succeeding thirty-three days of purity are subsumed in the fourteen days of impurity and sixty-six days of purity for a female. If the fetus emerged in pieces, or if it emerged reversed, i.e., feetfirst rather than headfirst, when most of its limbs emerge, its status is like that of a child born, with regard to the impurity of a woman after childbirth. If the fetus emerged in the usual manner, headfirst, it is not considered born until most of its head emerges. And what is considered most of its head? It is from when its forehead emerges. GEMARA: The Gemara asks: Now that with regard to a woman who gives birth to a ***tumtum*** alone, or a **hermaphrodite** alone, the mishna states that she shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female, as the sex of the offspring is uncertain, is it necessary for the mishna to rule that if a woman

gives birth to twins, a ***tumtum*** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth to both a male and a female? The Gemara answers: It was necessary for the mishna to state this *halakha*, lest you say that since Rabbi Yitzḥak says that the sex of a fetus is determined at the moment of conception, in that if the woman emits seed first she gives birth to a male, and if the man emits seed first she gives birth to a female, therefore one might say that since this offspring that was born with the ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is male, that ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is also male. Consequently, the mishna teaches us that the woman shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth to a female as well, as one can say that perhaps both the man and the woman emitted seed at the same time, which would mean that this offspring is male and that ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is female. Rav Naḥman says that Rav says: In the case of a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** who saw a white gonorrhea-like discharge [*ziva*], for which a man is impure, or who emitted a red discharge that had the appearance of menstrual blood, for which a woman is impure, if they entered the Temple they are not liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, as perhaps they are pure, in accordance with their true sex. And if they touched *teruma* after such a discharge, one does not burn the *teruma* due to their contact, as although impure *teruma* must be burned, the impurity in this case is uncertain. If a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** saw white *ziva* and red blood as one, i.e., they emitted both *ziva* and blood and are therefore impure regardless of their sex, they are still not liable for entering the Temple, but one does burn *teruma* due to their contact. The reason they are not liable for entering the Temple, despite the fact that they are definitely impure, is that it is stated: ‘Both male and female you shall send out, out of the camp you shall send them, so that they not impurify their camp, in the midst of which I dwell’ (Numbers 5:3). It is derived from the verse that only a definite male or a definite female is liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the following *baraita* supports the opinion of Rav: In the case of a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** who saw white *ziva* or red blood, they are not liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, and if they touch *teruma*, one does not burn the *teruma* due to their contact. If they saw white *ziva* and red blood as one, i.e., they emitted both *ziva* and blood, they are still not liable for entering the Temple, but one burns *teruma* due to their contact. The Gemara reasons: What is the reason that they are not liable for entering the Temple despite the fact that they are definitely impure? Is it not because it is stated in the verse: ‘Both male and female you shall send out,’ from which it is derived that only a definite male or a definite female could be liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**? Ulla says: No, Rav’s opinion cannot be proved from this *baraita*, as in accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. As we learned in a mishna (*Shevuot* 14b) that Rabbi Eliezer says: With regard to the sliding-scale offering the verse states: ‘Or if a person touches any impure thing…or the carcass of a non-kosher creeping animal, and it is hidden from him’ (Leviticus 5:2). A precise reading of this verse indicates that if one has a lapse of awareness that he contracted ritual impurity by touching a carcass of a creeping animal, he is liable to bring a sliding-scale offering for defiling the Temple or the sacrificial food, but he is not liable to bring such an offering for a lapse of awareness that he is entering the Temple or partaking of sacrificial food. Rabbi Akiva says that it is derived from the phrase: ‘And it is hidden from him, so that he is impure’ (Leviticus 5:2), that for a lapse of awareness that one had contracted ritual impurity, he is liable to bring a sliding-scale offering, but he is not liable to bring an offering for a lapse of awareness that he is entering the Temple or partaking of sacrificial food. And we say with regard to this mishna: What is

the difference between the opinions of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva? They are apparently stating the same *halakha*. And Ḥizkiyya says: There is a practical difference between them in a case where one initially knew that he had contracted ritual impurity, but he did not know whether the impurity was contracted from a carcass of a creeping animal or from the carcass of an unslaughtered animal. As Rabbi Eliezer holds that for one to be liable to bring an offering, we require that he initially know whether he contracted impurity from a carcass of a creeping animal or whether he contracted impurity from an unslaughtered animal carcass, and if he never knew this, he does not bring an offering. And Rabbi Akiva holds that for him to be liable to bring an offering, we do not require that he know this detail, since he knows in general terms that he contracted impurity. The Gemara infers: Doesn't Rabbi Eliezer say there, in that mishna, that we require one to bring an offering for entering the Temple in a state of impurity only if he knew initially whether he contracted impurity from a carcass of a creeping animal or whether he contracted impurity from an unslaughtered animal carcass? Here, too, with regard to a **hermaphrodite** or a ***tumtum*** who emitted both *ziva* and blood, they are not obligated to bring an offering according to Rabbi Eliezer, as we require one to bring an offering only if he knew whether he became impure due to the white *ziva* he emitted or whether he became impure due to the red blood he emitted. But according to Rabbi Akiva, who said that one is obligated to bring an offering due to his initial knowledge of his impurity even if he did not know the exact cause of his impurity, here too, in the case of a **hermaphrodite** or a ***tumtum*** who emitted both *ziva* and blood, he is obligated to bring an offering due to his initial knowledge of his impurity, despite the fact that he does not know whether he is impure due to the blood or the *ziva*. The Gemara asks: And according to Rav, who holds that an impure ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is not liable for entering the Temple but that any *teruma* that he touches is burned, what is different with regard to entering the Temple, for which he is not liable? The reason it is different is that it is written: "Both male and female you shall send out," from which it is derived that a definite male or a definite female is liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. If so, we should not burn *teruma* that he touches either, as it is written in a verse dealing with these types of impurity: "This is the law of the *zav*, and of one from whom the flow of semen emerges, so that he is thereby impure; and of her that is sick with her menstrual status, and they who have an issue, whether a male or a female" (Leviticus 15:32–33). It can similarly be derived from this verse that these types of impurity apply only to a definite male or a definite female, but not to a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.28a.12?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 28a:12)

(84) “GEMARA: The Sages taught the following *baraita*: All are obligated to sound the *shofar*: Priests, Levites, and ordinary Israelites; converts; freed slaves; a ***tumtum***, i.e., one whose sexual organs from birth are concealed or are so undeveloped that it is impossible to determine whether the individual is male or female; a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, i.e., one with **both male and female reproductive organs**; and a half-slave, half-freeman. A ***tumtum*** who sounds the *shofar* cannot discharge the obligation of one of his kind, i.e., a fellow ***tumtum***, since men are bound by the obligation, whereas women are not, and it is possible that the sounder is female and the hearer is male, nor can he discharge the obligation of one who is not of his kind, an ordinary man or woman. A **hermaphrodite** can discharge the obligation of one of his kind, a fellow **hermaphrodite**, since if the sounder is treated as a female, the hearer is also considered a female, but he cannot discharge the obligation of one who is not of his kind.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Rosh_Hashanah.29a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Rosh Hashanah 29a:9-10)

84 total mentions

(1) “All are obligated on the three pilgrim Festivals in the mitzva of appearance, i.e., to appear in the Temple as well as to sacrifice an offering, except for a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor; **and a tumtum, and a hermaphrodite**, and women, and slaves who are not emancipated; and the lame, and the blind, and the sick, and the old, and one who is unable to ascend to Jerusalem on his own legs.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Chagigah.1.1?lang=bi&lookup=Mishnah%20Chagigah&with=Lexicon&lang2=en: Mishnah, Chagigah 1:1)

(2) “A tumtum and an androgynous are obligated in all positive commandments because of the doubt [about their status].”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Fringes.3.9?lang=en: Mishneh Torah, Fringes 3:9

)

(3) “Rabbi Yose says: the **hermaphrodite** is a unique creature, and the sages could not decide about him. But this is not so with a **tumtum** (one of doubtful), for sometimes he is a man and sometimes he is a woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Bikkurim.4.5?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Mishna Bikkurim 4:5)

(4) “There are twelve involving the reproductive organs:
a-d) one whose member is crushed, mashed, severed, or cut off;
e-h) one whose testicles—or testicle—is crushed, mashed, severed, or cut off;
i) one who has only one testicle even though he has two sacs;
j) one whose two testicles are in one sac;
k) a person whose sexual organ is covered by flesh and his gender cannot be determined;
j) a hermaphrodite.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Admission_into_the_Sanctuary.7.8?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Mishneh Torah, Admission into the Sanctuary 7:8)

(5) “A guardian, an agent, a slave, a woman, **one of doubtful sex, or a hermaphrodite** bring the bikkurim, but do not recite, since they cannot say: ‘Which you, O Lord, have given to me’ (Deuteronomy 26:10).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Bikkurim.1.5?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Bikkurim 1:5)

(6, 7) “A person who possesses both a male sexual organ and a female sexual organ is called an **androgynous**. There is doubt whether such a person should be classified as a male or as a female; there is no physical sign that can ever enable such a distinction to be made.
A person who possesses neither a male sexual organ nor a female sexual organ, but instead, his genital area is a solid mass, is called a **tumtum**. There is also doubt with regard [to this person's status]. If an operation is carried out and a male [organ is revealed], he is definitely considered to be a male. If a female [organ is revealed], she is definitely considered to be a female.
When a **tumtum** or an **androgynous** reaches the age of twelve years and one day, they are assumed to be adults. Whenever these terms are mentioned, the intent is individuals of this age.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Marriage.2.24?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Mishneh Torah, Marriage 2:24-25)

(8) “If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: **If a priest who is a hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yehuda says: **If a tumtum, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch**. A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman but he may not be married by a man, as he is considered a man. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had had relations with a male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Yevamot.8.6?lang=en: Mishnah, Yevamot 8:6)

(9) “Rabbi Yitzḥak said: For what reason were our forefathers initially infertile? Because the Holy One, Blessed be He, desires the prayers of the righteous, and He therefore wanted them to pray for children. Similarly, Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Why are the prayers of the righteous compared to a pitchfork [eter], as in the verse: “And He let Himself be entreated [vaye’ater]”? This indicates that just as this pitchfork turns over produce from one place to another, so the prayer of the righteous turns over the attributes of the Holy One, Blessed be He, from the attribute of rage to the attribute of mercy. Rabbi Ami said: **Abraham and Sarah were originally tumtumin, people whose sexual organs are concealed and not functional**, as it is stated: “Look to the rock from where you were hewn, and to the hole of the pit from where you were dug” (Isaiah 51:1), and it is written in the next verse: “Look to Abraham your father and to Sarah who bore you” (Isaiah 51:2), **which indicates that sexual organs were fashioned for them, signified by the words hewn and dug, over the course of time.** Rav Naḥman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: **Our mother Sarah was initially a sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit], as it is stated: “And Sarah was barren; she had no child”** (Genesis 11:30). The superfluous words: “She had no child,” **indicate that she did not have even a place, i.e., a womb, for a child.** Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheilat, said in the name of Rav: They taught that he waits ten years only with regard to the people who lived in former generations, whose years were numerous, i.e., they lived longer. However, with regard to the people who live in later generations, whose years are few, he waits only two and half years before divorcing her, corresponding to the time period of three pregnancies. Rabba said in the name of Rav Naḥman: He waits three years, corresponding to the three remembrances of **barren women** by God, as the Master said: On Rosh HaShana Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah were remembered**,** i.e., God gave them children. Since God determines on Rosh HaShana whether **barren women** will conceive that year, one may remain married until three such opportunities have passed.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.64a.9?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 64a:9-64b:2)

(10, 11) “We learned in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda permits circumcising a **hermaphrodite** on Shabbat. Rav Sheizvi said that Rav Ḥisda said: Not with regard to all matters did Rabbi Yehuda say that a **hermaphrodite** is considered a male; it was only with regard to circumcision, as if you say so, that the legal status of a **hermaphrodite** is that of a male in every sense, then even with regard to vows of valuation, he should be valuated. And from where do we derive that he is not valuated? As it was taught in the Sifra, the halakhic midrash on Leviticus, with regard to the verse: “Then your valuation shall be for the male from the age of twenty years until the age of sixty years, your valuation shall be fifty shekel of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary” (Leviticus 27:3). The Sages inferred: “The male” means the definite male but not a **tumtum or a hermaphrodite**. I might have thought that these shall not be valuated according to the valuation of a man, but shall be valuated according to the valuation of a woman. Therefore, the verse states: “The male,” and in the following verse: “And if she is a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekels” (Leviticus 27:4), indicating: Only a definite male or a definite female, but not a **tumtum or a hermaphrodite**, which are categorized as neither male nor female. And an unattributed halakha cited in the Sifra generally reflects the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We too also learned in a mishna that Rabbi Yehuda does not consider a **hermaphrodite** to be a male in every sense. The Sages disagreed over sanctification of the waters of a purification offering, i.e., the placing of the ashes of the red heifer in potable, running spring water: Everyone is fit to sanctify the waters of a purification offering, except for a deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor. Rabbi Yehuda deems a minor fit, but deems a woman and a **hermaphrodite** unfit. Apparently, Rabbi Yehuda does not consider the legal status of a **hermaphrodite** to be like that of a male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.136b.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 136b:4-137a:3)

(12) “The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna in tractate *Para*: Everyone is qualified to sprinkle the purification waters, except for **a person whose sexual organs are concealed [*tumtum*]**, and a **hermaphrodite [*androginus*]**, and a woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yoma.43a.14?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yoma 43a:14)

(13, 14) “The mishna taught: And a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are exempt from the mitzva of appearance in the Temple. The Sages taught, with regard to the verse: “Three occasions in the year all your males will appear before the Lord God” (Exodus 23:17), had the verse simply said “males,” this would serve to exclude women from this mitzva. By specifying “your males,” it comes to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** as well.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Chagigah.4a.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Chagigah 4a:3)

(15, 16, 17, 18) “The Master said in the *baraita*: ‘Your males’ comes to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite.** The Gemara asks: **Granted,** the exclusion of **a hermaphrodite** was necessary, as it could enter your mind to say that since he possesses an aspect of masculinity, i.e., he has a male sexual organ, he should be obligated like a male. Therefore, the baraita teaches us that a hermaphrodite is a being unto itself, which is neither male nor female. However, as the status of a tumtum, who lacks external sexual organs, is a halakhic uncertainty, is a verse necessary to exclude an uncertainty? Abaye said: It is referring to a case when the testicles of a tumtum are on the outside, although his penis is not visible. The verse teaches that this tumtum is not obligated in the mitzva of appearance, despite the fact that he is certainly male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Chagigah.4a.6?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Chagigah 4a:6-7)

(19, 20) “The Gemara raises an objection from a different source: A priest who is a tumtum may not partake of teruma, but his wives and slaves may partake of it. A priest who had been circumcised, but subsequently the residual foreskin was drawn forward, and similarly one who was born circumcised, i.e., without a foreskin, may partake of teruma. A priest who is a hermaphrodite [androginos], possessing both male and female genitals, and was circumcised may partake of teruma, as whether he is male or female he is entitled to eat teruma, but he may not partake of sacrificial food, which is permitted only to male priests, as he might not be a male. A priest who is a tumtum may not partake of teruma or sacrificial food, as he might be a male, and since his member is hidden he cannot be circumcised.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.72a.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 72a:10)

(21) “The Gemara raises an objection from that which was taught in the Tosefta (Para 5:5): If a tumtum sanctified the purification waters by placing a small amount of ashes from the red heifer into springwater that had been placed into a container for that purpose, his sanctification is invalid because there is uncertainty as to whether he is uncircumcised, and an uncircumcised man is disqualified from sanctifying the purification waters. But if a **hermaphrodite** sanctified the purification waters, his sanctification is valid. Rabbi Yehuda disagrees and says: Even if a **hermaphrodite** sanctified the purification waters, his sanctification is invalid, because there is uncertainty as to whether a **hermaphrodite** is a woman, and a woman is disqualified from sanctifying the purification waters.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.72b.11?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 72b:11)

(22, 23) “The Sages taught: There are ten types of priests to whom one may not distribute *teruma* in the granary, and they are: A deaf-mute, an imbecile, and a minor, a person whose sexual organs are concealed **[*tumtum*]**, and a **hermaphrodite**, and a slave, and a woman, and an uncircumcised man, and a ritually impure man, and one who marries a woman who is unfit for him, i.e., who is unfit to marry a priest. And with regard to all of them, one may send *teruma* to them, to their homes, with the exception of a ritually impure man and one who marries a woman who is unfit for him. It is also inappropriate to distribute *teruma* to a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, as they are each an unusual creature of their own kind.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.99b.13?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 99b:13-100a:1)

(24) “MISHNA: If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*. Rabbi Yehuda says: If a ***tumtum*, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform *ḥalitza*, because he is treated like a **eunuch**. A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman but he may not be married by a man, as he is considered a man. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had had relations with a male. GEMARA: The Gemara questions the mishna’s teaching concerning a priest who was sexually impotent from birth: This is obvious; why should such a priest not enable his wife to partake of *teruma*? The Gemara answers: This *halakha* is necessary lest you say that since the verse states: “And such as are born in his house, they eat of his bread” (Leviticus 22:11), the allowance to eat *teruma* depends on the priest’s capacity to father children, i.e., that only one who can father children enables his wife to eat *teruma*, but one who cannot father children does not enable his wife to eat *teruma*. Therefore, the *tanna* teaches us that the priest’s capacity to have children is irrelevant. It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.81a.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 81a:3-6)

(25, 26, 27, 28, 29) “Rav Shmuel bar Yehuda said that Rabbi Abba, brother of Rabbi Yehuda bar Zavdi, said that Rav Yehuda said that Rav said: With regard to a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account for intercourse at two places, whether one penetrated him anally, in the manner of homosexual intercourse, or through his female organ. The Gemara raises an objection against this from the following teaching. Rabbi Eliezer said: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to be punished with stoning on his account as if he had relations with a male. In what case is this statement said? It is if he had relations with him through his male organ, i.e., in the manner of homosexual intercourse, but if he engaged in intercourse with him through his female organ, he is exempt. The Gemara answers that Rav stated

his opinion in accordance with the opinion of this *tanna*, as it is taught in the following *baraita*: Rabbi Simai says: With regard to a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to be punished with stoning on his account for intercourse at two places. The Gemara asks: What is the reasoning of Rabbi Simai? Rava said: The Sage bar Hamedurei explained the matter to me, based on an allusion to this *halakha* found in the Bible. The verse states: "And you shall not lie with a male as with a woman [*mishkevei isha*]" (Leviticus 18:22). The phrase *mishkevei isha*, referring to lying with a woman, appears in the plural. Now, what male has two manners of lying? You must say that this is referring to a **hermaphrodite**, and the plural form *mishkevei*, meaning: Lyings, indicates that there is liability for both manners of intercourse with him. The Gemara asks: And how do the Rabbis who disagree with Rabbi Simai counter this argument? The Gemara explains: Although he has two manners of lying, it is nevertheless written: "With a male," indicating that one is liable to be stoned on a **hermaphrodite**'s account only if he had relations with him in the manner of a male. The Gemara asks: And the Rabbis, who explain this entire verse as referring to a **hermaphrodite**, from where do they derive that a man is prohibited from engaging in relations with an ordinary male? The Gemara answers: They derive it from the words "a woman." The Gemara asks further: And from where do the Rabbis derive that one is liable to be punished for engaging in intercourse with a woman who is forbidden to him even if he engaged in relations in an unnatural manner, i.e., anal intercourse? The Gemara responds: They derive it from the inclusive "and" in "and…with a woman." Rav Shezvi said that Rav Ḥisda said: Not in all regards did Rabbi Eliezer say that a **hermaphrodite** is a proper male. As, if you say so, that a **hermaphrodite** is a proper male in every aspect, then with regard to consecrated animals an animal that is a **hermaphrodite** should become sacred if one consecrated it. And from where do we derive that it does not become sacred? As the Sages taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a bird used for sexual relations with a human being, and one set aside for idolatrous purposes, and one that itself was worshipped as an idol, and one given as payment to a prostitute (see Deuteronomy 23:19), and one that was the price of a dog received in exchange for the sale of a dog (see Deuteronomy 23:19), and similarly, a bird that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, if one killed any of these birds by pinching their necks in the manner of an offering rather than by ritual slaughter, the birds render him and the garments he is wearing ritually impure, when the birds are eaten and come into contact with his throat. The reason is that pinching is valid only for sacrificial birds; any other bird that is killed by pinching is deemed an unslaughtered carcass. Since none of these birds are fit to be sacrificed, pinching their necks renders them unslaughtered carcasses, and the unslaughtered carcass of a clean bird imparts ritual impurity when it is eaten and reaches the individual's throat. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one pinched the neck of a bird that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, it does not render him and the garments he is wearing ritually impure when it is eaten and comes into contact with his throat, as the sanctity of an offering does in fact apply to it. As Rabbi Eliezer would say: Wherever it is explicitly stated in the Torah "male" and "female," you are to remove a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as their gender status is in doubt. This is true of animal offerings, with regard to which the Torah uses the terms male and female. In the case of a bird-offering, however, since male and female are not stated with regard to it, but instead the Torah simply mentions turtledoves and young pigeons, you are not to remove a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as they are fit for the altar. It is evident then that Rabbi Eliezer maintains that a **hermaphrodite** is not considered a proper male with respect to offerings. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We too learned this explicitly in a *baraita* that states: Rabbi Eliezer says: Forbidden crossbred livestock, an animal with a condition that will cause it to die within

twelve months [*tereifa*], an animal delivered through the abdominal wall, and an animal that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite** do not become sacred and do not render another animal sacred in their place. And Shmuel said: They do not become sacred by way of substitution, i.e., if one had an animal that had been designated as an offering, and he wished to substitute one of these animals for it, the substituted animal does not become sacred. And they themselves do not render another animal sacred when it is made a substitute for them. If one designated one of these animals as an offering and he wished to substitute another animal for it, it does not become sacred. The Gemara concludes: Learn from this that Rabbi Eliezer does not consider a **hermaphrodite** to be a proper male. It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to be punished with stoning on his account as if one had relations with a male. It is taught on this matter in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi says: When I went to learn Torah from Rabbi Elazar ben Shamua, his students joined together against me like the roosters of Beit Bukya, highly aggressive animals that do not allow other creatures to remain among them, and they did not let me learn there. Therefore, I managed to learn only one thing in our mishna, which is that Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, one is liable to be punished with stoning on his account as if one had relations with a male."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.83b.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 83b:9-84a:3)

(30, 31) "If a daughter, a ***tumtum,* or a hermaphrodite [*androginos*]** is born to him, he is not a nazirite, since a son was not born to him. However, if he says: I am hereby a nazirite when I will have a child, then even if a daughter, a ***tumtum,* or a hermaphrodite** is born to him, he is a nazirite."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Nazir.12b.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Nazir 12b:10)

(32, 33) "The Gemara answers: This *halakha* is stated due to the latter clause of that mishna, which states that if a daughter, **a *tumtum,* or a hermaphrodite** are born to him, he is not a nazirite. The Gemara questions this, too: Isn't that obvious, since he specified a son? The Gemara answers: It is necessary lest you say he did not literally mean a son, but rather he meant to say: When I will be built up by means of any child, including the types listed. The mishna therefore teaches us that this is not the case. The mishna also taught: And if he said: When I have a child, then even if he has a daughter, a ***tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite**, his vow takes effect."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Nazir.13a.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Nazir 13a:3-4)

(34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45) "Rabbi Ami says: In the case of one whose sexual organs are indeterminate **[*tumtum*]** and whose skin became perforated so that his genitals were exposed and he was found to be a male, he does not take a double portion of his father's estate. As

the verse states: “And if the firstborn son was [*vehaya*] hers that was hated” (Deuteronomy 21:15), which is interpreted to mean that he is not considered a firstborn unless he is recognized as a son, i.e., male, from the moment of his coming into being [*havaya*], i.e., his birth. Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak says: A ***tumtum*** who was found to be male is also not judged as a stubborn and rebellious son, as the verse states: “If there will be [*yihyeh*] to a man a stubborn and rebellious son” (Deuteronomy 21:18), which is interpreted to mean that one is not judged in this manner unless he is recognized as a son from the moment of his coming into being. Ameimar says: A ***tumtum*** who was found to be male also does not reduce the additional portion of the firstborn. His portion is not taken into account in the calculation of the firstborn’s additional portion. For example, if there are three brothers: A firstborn, an ordinary brother, and a ***tumtum***, the firstborn receives one-third of the property as his additional portion, as he would if he and the ordinary brother were the only heirs, and the remaining two-thirds are divided among all three brothers. This is because it is stated with regard to the portion of the firstborn: “And they have borne him sons” (Deuteronomy 21:15), which is interpreted to mean that the brother of a firstborn does not affect his additional portion unless he is recognized as a son at the moment of his birth. Rav Sheizevi says: A ***tumtum*** who was found to be male is also not circumcised on the eighth day, if his eighth day occurs on Shabbat, although the mitzva of circumcision on the eighth day generally overrides Shabbat prohibtions. As the verse states: “If a woman bears seed and gives birth to a male then she shall be unclean seven days; as in the days of the impurity of her sickness shall she be unclean. And on the eighth day the flesh of his foreskin shall be circumcised” (Leviticus 12:2–3), which is interpreted to mean that he is not circumcised on the eighth day, in the event that it occurs on Shabbat, unless he is recognized as a male from the moment of his birth. Rav Sherevya says: His mother is also not rendered ritually impure due to his birth, as the verse states: “If a woman bears seed and gives birth to a male, then she shall be unclean seven days,” which is interpreted to mean that she is not rendered impure unless he is recognized as a male from the moment of his birth. The Gemara raises an objection from a mishna (*Nidda* 28a): A woman who miscarries a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]** observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth to a male and to a female. Since it is uncertain whether the fetus is male or female, the woman must observe the *halakhot* of ritual impurity according to both possibilities. This appears to be a conclusive refutation of the statement of Rav Sherevya that a woman who gives birth to a ***tumtum*** is not rendered impure at all. The Gemara affirms: This is a conclusive refutation. The Gemara asks: Shall we say it is also a conclusive refutation of the statement of Rav Sheizevi with regard to circumcision, as the *halakha* of circumsicion is stated together with the *halakha* of ritual impurity? The Gemara answers: The *tanna* of the mishna in tractate *Nidda* is uncertain whether the birth discussed in the verse includes that of a ***tumtum***, and therefore he rules stringently, that she should observe the *halakhot* of ritual impurity for both possibilities. Rav Sheizevi’s ruling can follow the same logic: The infant should not be circumcised on Shabbat, as it is uncertain whether the mitzva of his circumcision overrides the prohibitions of Shabbat. The Gemara asks: If so, that the *tanna* of the mishna in tractate *Nidda* is uncertain whether the birth discussed in the verse includes that of a ***tumtum***, the mishna should have stated that the woman observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth to both a male and to a female, and also as a menstruating woman. If it is uncertain whether the *halakhot* of ritual purity after birth pertain to a woman who gives birth to a ***tumtum*** at all, she should observe the *halakhot* of ritual impurity for any blood that emerges in the time period following the birth, as it should have the status of the blood of a menstruating woman. The Gemara concludes: This poses a difficulty.

Rava says that it is taught in a *baraita* in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Ami that a ***tumtum*** firstborn does not receive a double portion of the inheritance. The *baraita* states: From the phrase “the firstborn son” (Deuteronomy 21:15) it is derived that only a son receives a double portion, but not a *tumtum*, and only a definite firstborn receives a double portion, but not one about whom it is uncertain if he is a firstborn. The Gemara asks: Granted, the *halakha* that a son receives a double portion but a ***tumtum*** does not is understandable, as it is in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Ami, but what case does the *halakha* that only a definite firstborn receives a double portion but not one about whom it is uncertain if he is a firstborn serve to exclude?”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.126b.13?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 126b:13-127a:9)

(46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59) “And with regard to the latter clause of the mishna, which grants the ***tumtum*** nothing at all, there we arrive at the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, as it is taught in a mishna (*Temura* 24b): If one consecrates a firstborn animal while it is still a fetus, stating that if it is male it shall be a burnt-offering and if it is female it shall be a peace-offering, and the mother gave birth to a ***tumtum*** **or a hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: It is not imbued with sanctity, as **it is neither male nor female**. So too, in the case discussed in the mishna here, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel maintains that the ***tumtum*** receives nothing, as **he is considered to be a distinct entity of indeterminate sex, neither male nor female**. The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: A ***tumtum*** inherits as a son and is sustained as a daughter. Granted, according to Rava, the *baraita* can be explained to mean that the clause: Inherits as a son, is in the case of a small estate, as the daughters direct the ***tumtum*** to the sons, and just as there is no inheritance for the sons, there is none for the ***tumtum*** either. And the clause: And is sustained as a daughter, is in the case of a large estate, as the sons direct the ***tumtum*** to the daughters, and the ***tumtum*** receives sustenance along with them. But according to the opinion of Abaye, what does it mean that the ***tumtum*** is sustained as a daughter, since Abaye maintains that the ***tumtum*** does not have the rights of a daughter? The Gemara responds: And according to your reasoning, even according to Rava, what does it mean that a ***tumtum*** inherits as a son, since Rava concedes that the ***tumtum*** and sons do not actually inherit anything? Rather, the *baraita* means that it is fitting for the ***tumtum*** to inherit but he does not actually inherit. Here too, with regard to sustenance, according to Abaye, the *baraita* means that it is fitting for the ***tumtum*** to be sustained, but he is not actually sustained.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.140b.8?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 140b:8-141a:1)

(60) “Why must the verse state: “For any man [*ish ish*],” repeating the term *ish*? It is to include not only a son, but also a daughter, **one whose sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*], and a hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.66a.8?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 66a:8)

(61) “What is the meaning when the verse states redundantly: “*Ish ish*”? It serves to include not only a son, but also a daughter, **one whose sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*], and a hermaphrodite** who curse their parent.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.85b.8?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 85b:8)

(62) “The Gemara answers: He requires the other verse to include a daughter, **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite** in the prohibition against cursing a parent.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.85b.11?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 85b:11)

(63) “Rav Naḥman bar Yitzḥak said: We learn in the *baraita* as well: A bird that was the object of bestiality, or that was set aside for idol worship, or that was worshipped as a deity, or that was given as payment to a prostitute or as the price of a dog, or that was **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, in all of those cases, if its nape was pinched, it renders the garments of one who swallows an olive-bulk from the carcass ritually impure when it is in the throat, as is the *halakha* with regard to all unslaughtered carcasses of birds.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zevachim.85b.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Zevachim 85b:10)

(64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110, 111, 112, 113, 114, 115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123, 124, 125, 126, 127, 128, 129, 130, 131, 132, 133, 134, 135, 136, 137, 138, 139, 140, 141) “The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita*: Rabbi Ilai says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: A **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn, and it comes with its blemish. Learn from the *baraita* that it is obvious to Rabbi Yishmael that a **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn. The Gemara responds: But perhaps he said his ruling in the manner of: If you say, as explained earlier. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear another *baraita*. It states with regard to a burnt offering from cattle: “A male” (Leviticus 1:3), from which it can be inferred: But not a female. When it says below, with regard to a burnt offering from sheep: “A male” (Leviticus 1:10), a second time, it is difficult to understand, as there is no need for the verse to state this. Why must the verse state “a male” again? This serves to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, which are disqualified from being sacrificed as burnt offerings. The Gemara analyzes this *baraita*: Whose opinion is this? If we say it is the opinion of the first *tanna* of the mishna, who maintains that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** may not be slaughtered in the Temple or in the rest of the country, then the status of a **hermaphrodite** is uncertain, as **it is unknown whether it is male or female**. But does a verse come to exclude a case of uncertainty? Rather, perhaps this *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of the latter Rabbis in the mishna, who hold that a **hermaphrodite** is definitely not a male, but a distinct entity. Therefore, it is necessary for a verse to exclude it. This, too, is difficult, as according to these Rabbis the exclusion of a female, **a *tumtum*, and a**

hermaphrodite is derived from one verse alone. The Gemara elaborates: As with regard to a firstborn, it is one "male" alone that is written, from which the Rabbis exclude all of the three categories from firstborn status. By contrast, the *baraita* excludes a female from one mention of the word "male" and **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from another mention of the word "male." Rather, it is obvious that the *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael. And in that case, granted, if you say that it is obvious to Rabbi Yishmael that a **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn male, that is why a verse was necessary to exclude a **hermaphrodite** from being brought as a burnt offering. But if you say that Rabbi Yishmael is uncertain whether or not a **hermaphrodite** is considered a male, is it necessary for the verse to exclude a case of uncertainty? The Gemara responds: Actually, the *baraita* is in accordance with the opinion of the latter Rabbis, who maintain that a **hermaphrodite** is not a male, but a distinct entity. And as for the difficulty that in the case of a firstborn they excluded a female, **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite** from a single verse, that is not so. With regard to a firstborn there are also two verses written: "Males" (Deuteronomy 15:19), and: "That is a male" (Exodus 13:12). As in the case of a burnt offering, one of these serves to exclude a female, while the other serves to exclude **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**. The mishna teaches: And the Rabbis say: A **hermaphrodite** does not have firstborn status; rather, its status is that of a non-sacred animal that may be shorn and utilized for labor. Rav Ḥisda says: This dispute applies to **a hermaphrodite, which the Rabbis maintain is a distinct entity, as it has both male and female sex organs**, and therefore it does not have firstborn status. But with regard to a ***tumtum***, whose genitalia is covered by skin, everyone agrees that it is an uncertain case, as it is definitely either a male or a female, but there is uncertainty as to which it is. And consequently, it is consecrated due to uncertainty, and it may not be slaughtered either in the Temple or in the rest of the country. Rava said to Rav Ḥisda: If that is so, that a ***tumtum*** is certainly either a male or a female, with regard to valuations, when someone vows to give the valuation of a ***tumtum***, it should be valuated, either in accordance with the valuation of a man or a woman. Why, then, is it taught in a *baraita* that the verse: "Then your valuation shall be for the male" (Leviticus 27:3), includes one whose status as a male is certain but not a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**? The Gemara answers: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***, as it is referring only to a **hermaphrodite**, which is a distinct entity. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear the continuation of that *baraita*: One might have thought that these shall not be valuated according to the valuation of a man, but they shall be valuated according to the valuation of a woman. Therefore, the verse states: "The male," and in the following verse it states: "And if she is a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekels" (Leviticus 27:4), indicating only one whose status as a male or female is certain, but not **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite, which are categorized as neither male nor female**. The Gemara again answers: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***, as it is referring only to a **hermaphrodite**. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita* discussing the peace offering, with regard to which it states: "Whether male or female" (Leviticus 3:1). This indicates: Only a definite male or a definite female, but not **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**. Yet again the Gemara responds: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita*: It states with regard to a burnt offering from cattle: "A male" (Leviticus 1:3), from which it can be inferred: But not a female. When it says below, with regard to a burnt offering from sheep: "A male" (Leviticus 1:10), a second time, it is difficult to understand, as there is no need for the verse to state this. Why must the verse state "a male" again? This serves to exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, which are disqualified as burnt offerings. The Gemara answers: Omit from this

baraita the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a *baraita* discussing the *halakhot* of ritual impurity imparted by a bird in the throat: Any bird that was not slaughtered in the proper manner, i.e., in its neck with a knife, has the status of a carcass. This carcass renders the one who eats it impure when it is in his throat. Bird offerings, which are killed by pinching the nape of the neck with a fingernail, are the exception to this principle, and they do not impart impurity. With regard to a bird that is worshipped as a deity, or one set aside for idol worship, or one given as payment to a prostitute, or one that was given as the price of a dog (see Deuteronomy 23:19), and similarly with regard to a bird that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, if one killed any of them by pinching, they are ritually impure, as they are disqualified as offerings, and the pinching does not purify them. Therefore, they all render a person and the garments he is wearing ritually impure if an olive-bulk of them comes into contact with the throat while eating. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one pinched the neck of a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, it does not render the person and the garments he is wearing ritually impure when they are in the throat, as they are in fact fit to be sacrificed. As Rabbi Eliezer would say: Wherever it is stated explicitly in the Torah: "Male," and: "Female," you should exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as their status is uncertain. This applies to animal offerings, with regard to which the Torah states "male" and "female." But in the case of a bird offering, since "male" and "female" are not stated with regard to it, but simply doves and pigeons are stated with regard to it, you do not exclude a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** from among them, as they are fit for the altar. Now if a ***tumtum*** is considered either definitely a male or a female, then why does the first *tanna* disqualify it from being sacrificed? The Gemara again replies: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear that Rabbi Elazar says: An animal with a condition that will cause it to die within twelve months [*tereifa*], and prohibited diverse kinds of livestock, and an animal born by caesarean section, and an animal that is a ***tumtum* or a hermaphrodite** do not become consecrated and do not render another animal consecrated in their place. And Shmuel says in explanation: They do not become consecrated by substitution, i.e., if one sought to substitute one of these animals for a sacrificial animal, it does not become sacred. And if one of these was born to a sacrificial animal, they do not render a non-sacred animal consecrated in a case where one wanted to render it a substitute for them. And if a ***tumtum*** is either a male or female, why would it not become consecrated and render another animal consecrated? The Gemara answers: Omit from this *baraita* the mention of a ***tumtum***. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a slightly different version of that *baraita*. Rabbi Elazar says: There are five types of animals that do not become consecrated and do not render another animal consecrated, and they are: A *tereifa*, and prohibited diverse kinds of livestock, and an animal born by caesarean section, and an animal that is **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite**. And if you would say: Here too, omit from this *baraita* a ***tumtum***, then there are only four types of animals listed in the *baraita*. The Gemara answers: Remove the mention of a ***tumtum*** and in its place insert an orphan, i.e., an animal born after the death of its mother, which is also disqualified as a sacrifice. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that this question of whether a ***tumtum*** is a distinct entity or is definitely either a male or female is the subject of a dispute between *tanna'im*. As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Ilai says in the name of Rabbi Yishmael: A **hermaphrodite** is a firstborn, and it comes with its blemish; and the Rabbis say: It is not imbued with sanctity. Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: The verse states: "Males" (Deuteronomy 15:19), and wherever it is stated: Male," this serves to exclude only **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**. Since according to Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda it is necessary for a verse to exclude a ***tumtum*, like a hermaphrodite**, from the category of

a male, evidently in his opinion a ***tumtum*** is not considered to be one whose status as a male is uncertain but a distinct entity. The Gemara analyzes this *baraita*: And if you would say: Here too, omit from this *baraita* a ***tumtum***, then the opinion of Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda is the same as that of the Rabbis, as they too maintain that a **hermaphrodite** is not sacred. Rather, is it not that the difference between them is with regard to the status of a ***tumtum***, as the first *tanna*, i.e., the Rabbis, holds: It is not imbued with sanctity, and they are referring specifically to a **hermaphrodite**, which was the subject of Rabbi Ilai's statement, but a ***tumtum*** is an uncertain case, and therefore it is sacred due to uncertainty. ben Yehuda comes to say: A ***tumtum*** is not of uncertain status, but a distinct entity, and it is not sacred at all. The Gemara responds: No, everyone agrees with regard to the statement that a ***tumtum*** is a distinct entity that there is no doubt that this is incorrect. Where there is doubt is with regard to whether it is a male or a female. In addition, in a case where the ***tumtum*** urinates from the place of the male sex organ, then everyone agrees that it is a male. When they disagree is in the case of a ***tumtum*** that urinates from the place of the female sex organ. One Sage, the Rabbis, holds that we are concerned that perhaps its male sex organ was inverted toward its female sex organ; therefore, it is of uncertain status. And one Sage, Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda, holds that we are not concerned about this possibility; rather, it is definitely a female. And Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda maintains in accordance with that which Rabbi Elazar ruled: With regard to a firstborn animal that urinates from the place where the female sex organ is found, it is non-sacred, as it is certainly a female. Rabbi Yoḥanan wondered about this ruling of Rabbi Elazar: Who is the Sage who is not concerned about the opinion of the first *tanna* in the mishna and about the opinion of Rabbi Yishmael, who maintain that a ***tumtum*** is a case of uncertainty? The Gemara asks: And let Rabbi Yoḥanan also say: Who is this who is not concerned about the opinion of the latter Rabbis in the mishna, as Rav Ḥisda says: This dispute refers to a **hermaphrodite**; but with regard to a ***tumtum***, everyone agrees that it is an uncertain case. The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yoḥanan does not hold in accordance with that statement of Rav Ḥisda; rather, he maintains that according to the latter Rabbis a ***tumtum*** is a distinct entity. The Gemara asks: If Rabbi Yoḥanan does not hold in accordance with Rav Ḥisda, why did he wonder about Rabbi Elazar's ruling? Let him say that Rabbi Elazar said his opinion in accordance with the opinion of the latter Rabbis. The Gemara answers: That is indeed what he is saying: Who is the Sage who leaves aside the opinion of two Sages, the first *tanna* and Rabbi Yishmael, and acts in accordance with one opinion, the latter Rabbis? The Gemara asks: And Rabbi Elazar, in accordance with whose opinion does he hold? The Gemara answers that he holds in accordance with that which Reish Lakish says: The Sages said that the halakhic status of a ***tumtum*** is an uncertain case only with regard to a person, since the male sex organ and the female sex organ are in one place, i.e., a man and a woman urinate from the same area of the body. Since that area is concealed in the case of a ***tumtum***, its status is uncertain. But with regard to a ***tumtum*** animal, there is no uncertainty whether it is a male or a female, as the genitals of a male and a female are not found in the same place. Rather, if it urinates from the place of the male sex organ, it is a male; if it urinates from the place of the female sex organ, it is a female. Rav Oshaya objects to this: And let us be concerned that perhaps its male sex organ was turned round to the place of its female sex organ. Abaye said to him: In accordance with whose opinion do you raise this objection? Is it in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, who is concerned about the minority of cases? The *halakha* is not in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Meir, and therefore one should follow the majority of animals, to whom this does not occur. Abaye bar Avin and Rav Ḥananya bar Avin both say: You may even say that Rav Oshaya's objection is in

accordance with the opinion of the Rabbis, who are not concerned about a minority. The reason is that since in this case, the animal has changed in that it is different from typical animals, as it is a ***tumtum***, perhaps it is also changed with regard to its male sex organ being inverted toward the female sex organ. If so, the Sages disagree with regard to this principle: There are those who say that since it has changed, it has changed, and there are those who say that the claim that since it has changed, it has changed is not accepted. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the question of whether an animal that has changed in one respect has changed in a different respect, or whether it has not changed, is the subject of a dispute between *tanna'im*. As it is taught in a *baraita*: With regard to a ***tumtum*** who betrothed a woman, the betrothal is considered a betrothal, due to uncertainty, as the ***tumtum*** might be a male; and similarly, if the ***tumtum*** was betrothed by a man, the betrothal is deemed a betrothal due to uncertainty, as the ***tumtum*** might be a female. The *baraita* continues: And if the brother of the ***tumtum*** died childless, and there is no other brother who can perform levirate marriage with the widow, the ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza*, i.e., his brother's widow removes his shoe, as the ***tumtum*** might be a male, and she would require *ḥalitza* to release her from the levirate bond. And if the ***tumtum*** died, one of the brothers of the ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* with the wife of the ***tumtum***, or enters into levirate marriage with the wife of the ***tumtum***, in case the ***tumtum*** was a male. And it is taught in another *baraita*: The wife of a ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* and does not enter into levirate marriage. With regard to these two *baraitot*, the Sages assumed that everyone holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who says: **A eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, i.e., one who was entirely lacking in sexual capacity from birth, does not perform *ḥalitza* and does not enter into levirate marriage with his sister-in-law, as he is not included in the mitzva of levirate marriage. Likewise, if he died his brothers do not perform *ḥalitza* with his wife, and they may not enter into levirate marriage with her, as she is forbidden to them as a brother's wife who does not require levirate marriage. Based on this assumption, the Gemara suggests: What, is it not that the two *baraitot* disagree about this, that the one who says that a ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* and one of the brothers performs *ḥalitza* with the wife of the ***tumtum*** or enters into levirate marriage with the wife of the ***tumtum*** holds that we do not say that since this ***tumtum*** has changed from an average person, he might also have changed in that he is a **eunuch** whose condition is caused naturally, and therefore the brothers would be prohibited from entering into levirate marriage with the wife? Rather, if the ***tumtum*** is a male, it is assumed that he is capable of fathering children, and consequently his wife requires levirate marriage. And the one who says that the wife of a ***tumtum*** performs *ḥalitza* and does not enter into levirate marriage maintains that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, i.e., the possibility that he might be a **eunuch** whose condition is caused naturally is considered, and therefore his wife may not enter into levirate marriage. The Gemara responds: No; everyone agrees that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, and there is a concern that he might be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Rather, the difference between the rulings is that this *baraita*, which permits the wife of the ***tumtum*** to enter levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who disagrees with Rabbi Akiva and maintains that levirate marriage may be performed with the wife of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and that *baraita*, which prohibits levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, that the brothers of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** do not enter into levirate marriage with the wife of the ***tumtum***. The Gemara asks: And who is the *tanna* who holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva that the wife of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** does not require levirate marriage, and

yet he maintains that the wife of a ***tumtum*** must perform *ḥalitza*? If we say it is Rabbi Yehuda, this cannot be, as in his opinion even if the genitals of a ***tumtum*** were revealed and he was found to be a male, he deems him like a definite **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and therefore his wife does not require *ḥalitza* at all. As we learned in a mishna (*Yevamot* 81a) that Rabbi Yehuda says: With regard to a ***tumtum*** who was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform *ḥalitza*, because he is treated like a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Just as this ***tumtum*** does not perform *ḥalitza*, so too, his widow does not require *ḥalitza*. Rather, it is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that if a ***tumtum*** was torn open and he was found to be a male, he is considered as a matter of uncertainty to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** and consequently his wife requires *ḥalitza*. As it is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: A ***tumtum*** does not perform *ḥalitza* with the wife of his late, childless brother if there are other brothers to perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps the skin covering his genitals will be torn open and he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and the widow would not be released from the levirate bond by his *ḥalitza*. According to this opinion, it is not certain that a ***tumtum*** would be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. With regard to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, the Gemara asks: Why does this individual not perform *ḥalitza* due only to the possibility that he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**? Is that to say that every ***tumtum*** whose skin was torn is found to be a male and is not found to be a female? The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, said his opinion in the formulation of: Perhaps, which includes multiple uncertainties: A ***tumtum*** must not perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a female, who can certainly not perform *ḥalitza*. Alternatively, if he is found to be a male, he may also not perform *ḥalitza*, since perhaps he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. The Gemara asks: Since both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, agree that a ***tumtum*** may not perform *ḥalitza* for his brother's wife, what is the practical difference between their opinions?"

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41b.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41b:3-42b:18)

(142, 143) "With regard to an animal that copulated with a person, or an animal that was the object of bestiality, or an animal that was set aside for idol worship, or one that was worshipped as a deity, or one that was given as payment to a prostitute or as the price of a dog, or a ***tumtum***, i.e., an animal whose **sexual organs are indeterminate, or a hermaphrodite**, i.e., an animal **displaying sexual organs of both sexes**, all of these enter the pen to be tithed despite the fact that they are disqualified from being brought as offerings. Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: A ***tumtum*** **and a hermaphrodite** do not enter the pen to be tithed."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.57a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 57a:9)

(144, 145, 146, 147, 148) “Finally, with regard to an animal that is **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite,** the *tanna* holds that it is uncertain whether it is male or female, not a creature unto itself, and therefore a ***tumtum*** is also subject to the tithe. The *baraita* states that Rabbi Shimon ben Yehuda says in the name of Rabbi Shimon: **A *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** do not enter the pen to be tithed. The Gemara explains: He holds that the case of an animal that is **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite** involves an uncertainty, and the Merciful One excluded cases of uncertainty with regard to sacrificial animals. Only a definite male or a definite female is fit to be sacrificed on the altar, but not **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.57a.15?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 57a:15-16)

(149, 150) “A ***tumtum***, whose sexual organs are concealed, and a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, vow, and are the object of a vow, and take vows of valuation, but they are not valuated. Consequently, if one says, with regard to a ***tumtum***: The valuation of so-and-so is incumbent upon me to donate to the Temple treasury, he is not obligated to pay anything, as only a definite male or a definite female are valuated.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.2a.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 2a:2)

(151, 152) “The mishna teaches that one does not slaughter a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, neither in the Temple nor in the rest of the country. The Gemara asks: Granted, one does not slaughter a ***tumtum***, neither in the Temple, as perhaps it is a female and therefore does not have firstborn status and may not be sacrificed, nor in the rest of the country, as perhaps it is a male and it does not have a blemish, in which case he would be slaughtering a sacrificial animal. But in the case of a **hermaphrodite**, granted that one does not slaughter it in the Temple, as perhaps it is a female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41a.17?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41a:17-18)

(153) “If one were to suggest that this serves to add **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite,** that cannot be correct, as they are explicitly taught in the mishna itself.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.2a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 2a:9)

(154) “One can argue that so too, anyone who is included in the *halakha* of valuations is included in the ram of the guilt offering. Therefore, **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, who are not included in the *halakha* of valuations, as stated in the mishna, should also not be included in the ram of the guilt offering.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.4a.14?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 4a:14)

(155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160) “A *baraita* teaches that the apparently superfluous phrase: “Then your valuation shall be” (Leviticus 27:3), serves to include **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** in the *halakha* of assessments, despite the fact that they are not included in the *halakha* of valuations. If one assesses **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, he is obligated to give that assessment. The *baraita* explains that one might have thought that since the verse states: “A vow of persons to the Lord, according to your valuation,” anyone who is included in the category of valuations is also included in the category of assessments, but anyone who is not included in the category of valuations is also not included in the category of assessments. Therefore, the verse states: “Then your valuation shall be,” to include **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** in the *halakha* of assessment. The *baraita* continues: This *halakha*, that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are not included in valuation, is derived from the term: “The male” (Leviticus 27:3). The definite article teaches that this *halakha* applies specifically to a male, and not to **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**. One might have thought that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** should not be valuated by the valuation of a man, but they should be valuated by the valuation of a woman. Therefore, the verse states: “Then your valuation shall be for the male…and if it be a female” (Leviticus 27:3–4). This teaches that valuation applies only to a definite male or a definite female, but not to **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**, who are categorized as neither male nor female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.4b.4?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 4b:4-5)

(161, 162, 163, 164) “The *baraita* also teaches that the phrase: “Then your valuation shall be” (Leviticus 27:2), serves to include **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** in the *halakha* of assessments, despite the fact that they are not included in the *halakha* of valuations. The Gemara asks: Why do I need a verse to include them in the *halakha* of assessments? Even let this be considered only like the assessment of a tree; were one to say: The assessment of that tree is incumbent upon me, is he not obligated to give its assessment? Rava said: The verse serves to say that **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are assessed by the significance of the body part that one specified. If one vowed to give a vital part of his body, he is not merely obligated to pay the value of that organ but must give the value of his entire body. As it might enter your mind to say that since it is written in the verse: “A vow of persons to the Lord, according to your valuation,” a person who is valuated is juxtaposed to one who is the object of a vow of assessments. Therefore, anyone who is included in the category of valuations is also included in the *halakha* of being assessed by the significance of the body part that he specifies. But anyone who is not included in the category of valuations, such as **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, is not included in the *halakha* of being assessed by the significance of the body part that he specifies. Therefore, the verse teaches that although **a *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** are not included in valuations, they are nevertheless included in the *halakha* of being assessed by the significance of the body part in question.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.4b.21?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 4b:21-23)

(165) “As the mishna teaches (2a): **A *tumtum* and a hermaphrodite** vow, are the object of a vow, and take vows of valuation, but they are not valuated.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.5b.13?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 5b:13)

(166, 167) “The Gemara cites another version of the above discussion, which cites the continuation of Rabbi Meir’s statement: But with regard to an animal born of diverse kinds, and **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite**, you find that they can be consecrated only when they are offspring of sacrificial animals, i.e., a consecrated animal impregnated by an animal of a different species, or whose fetus was **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.11a.12?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 11a:12)

(168) “Come and hear, as Rabbi Elazar says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and a ***tumtum*** animal, and a **hermaphrodite** animal are not sacred through consecration and they do not sanctify non-sacred animals by means of substitution.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.17a.21?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 17a:21)

(169) “If the animal gave birth to a ***tumtum***, **whose gender is unknown**, or a **hermaphrodite, which has both male and female sexual organs**, both of which are unfit for sacrifice, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: They are not imbued with sanctity.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.24b.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 24b:3)

(170) “The mishna teaches: If the animal gave birth to **a *tumtum* or a hermaphrodite,** Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: They are not imbued with sanctity.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.24b.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 24b:10)

(171) “All are eligible to sprinkle, except a tumtum, a hermaphrodite, a woman, and a child that is without understanding.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Parah.12.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah Parah 12:10)

(172, 173, 174, 175) “A woman who discharges or gives birth to a **tumtum**, **whose sexual organs are obscured**, or to a **hermaphrodite [ve’androginos]**, **who has both male and female sexual organs**, shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. She is impure for fourteen days like a woman who gave birth to a female, but blood that she sees thereafter is pure only until forty days after birth, like for a woman who gave birth to a male. In a case where she gave birth to twins, if they are a **tumtum** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. But if the twins are a **tumtum** and a female, or a **hermaphrodite** and a female, she shall observe the periods of purity and impurity established by the Torah for a woman who gives birth to a female alone. Regardless of the status of the **tumtum and the hermaphrodite**, the woman’s seven days of impurity and her succeeding thirty-three days of purity are subsumed in the fourteen days of impurity and sixty-six days of purity for a female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Niddah.3.5?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Niddah 3:5)

(176, 177, 178, 179, 180, 181, 182, 183, 184, 185, 186, 187, 188, 189, 190, 191, 192, 193, 194) "MISHNA: A woman who discharges or gives birth to a ***tumtum*, whose sexual organs are obscured, or to a hermaphrodite [*ve'androginos*], who has both male and female sexual organs**, shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. She is impure for fourteen days like a woman who gave birth to a female, but blood that she sees thereafter is pure only until forty days after birth, like for a woman who gave birth to a male. In a case where she gave birth to twins, if they are a ***tumtum*** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she observes the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female. But if the twins are a ***tumtum*** and a female, or a **hermaphrodite** and a female, she shall observe the periods of purity and impurity established by the Torah for a woman who gives birth to a female alone. Regardless of the status of the ***tumtum*** and the **hermaphrodite**, the woman's seven days of impurity and her succeeding thirty-three days of purity are subsumed in the fourteen days of impurity and sixty-six days of purity for a female. If the fetus emerged in pieces, or if it emerged reversed, i.e., feetfirst rather than headfirst, when most of its limbs emerge, its status is like that of a child born, with regard to the impurity of a woman after childbirth. If the fetus emerged in the usual manner, headfirst, it is not considered born until most of its head emerges. And what is considered most of its head? It is from when its forehead emerges. GEMARA: The Gemara asks: Now that with regard to a woman who gives birth to a ***tumtum*** alone, or a **hermaphrodite** alone, the mishna states that she shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth both to a male and to a female, as the sex of the offspring is uncertain, is it necessary for the mishna to rule that if a woman gives birth to twins, a ***tumtum*** and a male, or a **hermaphrodite** and a male, she shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth to both a male and a female? The Gemara answers: It was necessary for the mishna to state this *halakha*, lest you say that since Rabbi Yitzḥak says that the sex of a fetus is determined at the moment of conception, in that if the woman emits seed first she gives birth to a male, and if the man emits seed first she gives birth to a female, therefore one might say that since this offspring that was born with the ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is male, that ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is also male. Consequently, the mishna teaches us that the woman shall observe the strictures of a woman who gave birth to a female as well, as one can say that perhaps both the man and the woman emitted seed at the same time, which would mean that this offspring is male and that ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is female. Rav Naḥman says that Rav says: In the case of a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** who saw a white gonorrhea-like discharge [*ziva*], for which a man is impure, or who emitted a red discharge that had the appearance of menstrual blood, for which a woman is impure, if they entered the Temple they are not liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, as perhaps they are pure, in accordance with their true sex. And if they touched *teruma* after such a discharge, one does not burn the *teruma* due to their contact, as although impure *teruma* must be burned, the impurity in this case is uncertain. If a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** saw white *ziva* and red blood as one, i.e., they emitted both *ziva* and blood and are therefore impure regardless of their sex, they are still not liable for entering the Temple, but one does burn *teruma* due to their contact. The reason they are not liable for entering the Temple, despite the fact that they are definitely impure, is that it is stated: 'Both male and female you shall send out, out of the camp you shall send them, so that they not impurify their camp, in the midst of which I dwell' (Numbers 5:3). It is derived from the verse that only a definite male or a definite female is liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. The Gemara suggests: Let us say that the following *baraita* supports the opinion of Rav: In the case of a ***tumtum*** and a

hermaphrodite who saw white *ziva* or red blood, they are not liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, and if they touch *teruma*, one does not burn the *teruma* due to their contact. If they saw white *ziva* and red blood as one, i.e., they emitted both *ziva* and blood, they are still not liable for entering the Temple, but one burns *teruma* due to their contact. The Gemara reasons: What is the reason that they are not liable for entering the Temple despite the fact that they are definitely impure? Is it not because it is stated in the verse: 'Both male and female you shall send out,' from which it is derived that only a definite male or a definite female could be liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**? Ulla says: No, Rav's opinion cannot be proved from this *baraita*, as in accordance with whose opinion is this *baraita*? It is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer. As we learned in a mishna (*Shevuot* 14b) that Rabbi Eliezer says: With regard to the sliding-scale offering the verse states: 'Or if a person touches any impure thing…or the carcass of a non-kosher creeping animal, and it is hidden from him' (Leviticus 5:2). A precise reading of this verse indicates that if one has a lapse of awareness that he contracted ritual impurity by touching a carcass of a creeping animal, he is liable to bring a sliding-scale offering for defiling the Temple or the sacrificial food, but he is not liable to bring such an offering for a lapse of awareness that he is entering the Temple or partaking of sacrificial food. Rabbi Akiva says that it is derived from the phrase: 'And it is hidden from him, so that he is impure' (Leviticus 5:2), that for a lapse of awareness that one had contracted ritual impurity, he is liable to bring a sliding-scale offering, but he is not liable to bring an offering for a lapse of awareness that he is entering the Temple or partaking of sacrificial food. And we say with regard to this mishna: What is the difference between the opinions of Rabbi Eliezer and Rabbi Akiva? They are apparently stating the same *halakha*. And Ḥizkiyya says: There is a practical difference between them in a case where one initially knew that he had contracted ritual impurity, but he did not know whether the impurity was contracted from a carcass of a creeping animal or from the carcass of an unslaughtered animal. As Rabbi Eliezer holds that for one to be liable to bring an offering, we require that he initially know whether he contracted impurity from a carcass of a creeping animal or whether he contracted impurity from an unslaughtered animal carcass, and if he never knew this, he does not bring an offering. And Rabbi Akiva holds that for him to be liable to bring an offering, we do not require that he know this detail, since he knows in general terms that he contracted impurity. The Gemara infers: Doesn't Rabbi Eliezer say there, in that mishna, that we require one to bring an offering for entering the Temple in a state of impurity only if he knew initially whether he contracted impurity from a carcass of a creeping animal or whether he contracted impurity from an unslaughtered animal carcass? Here, too, with regard to a **hermaphrodite** or a ***tumtum*** who emitted both *ziva* and blood, they are not obligated to bring an offering according to Rabbi Eliezer, as we require one to bring an offering only if he knew whether he became impure due to the white *ziva* he emitted or whether he became impure due to the red blood he emitted. But according to Rabbi Akiva, who said that one is obligated to bring an offering due to his initial knowledge of his impurity even if he did not know the exact cause of his impurity, here too, in the case of a **hermaphrodite** or a ***tumtum*** who emitted both *ziva* and blood, he is obligated to bring an offering due to his initial knowledge of his impurity, despite the fact that he does not know whether he is impure due to the blood or the *ziva*. The Gemara asks: And according to Rav, who holds that an impure ***tumtum*** or **hermaphrodite** is not liable for entering the Temple but that any *teruma* that he touches is burned, what is different with regard to entering the Temple, for which he is not liable? The reason it is different is that it is written: "Both male and female you shall send out," from which it is derived that a definite male or

a definite female is liable for entering the Temple in a state of impurity, but not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. If so, we should not burn *teruma* that he touches either, as it is written in a verse dealing with these types of impurity: “This is the law of the *zav,* and of one from whom the flow of semen emerges, so that he is thereby impure; and of her that is sick with her menstrual status, and they who have an issue, whether a male or a female” (Leviticus 15:32–33). It can similarly be derived from this verse that these types of impurity apply only to a definite male or a definite female, but not to a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.28a.12?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 28a:12)

(195, 196, 197, 198, 199, 200, 201, 202, 203, 204, 205) “With regard to Rav’s *halakha* that the prohibition of entering the Temple in a state of ritual impurity does not apply to one who is a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**, the Gemara asks: If so, then even when they become impure with other types of impurity, in addition to the impurity of a *zav* or a menstruating woman, a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** should likewise not be sent out of the Temple, as the passage from which a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** are excluded is also referring to other types of impurity: ‘That they put out of the camp every leper, and every one that has an issue, and whatever is impure by the dead’ (Numbers 5:2). The Gemara answers: The next verse states: ‘Both male,’ which is referring to impurity caused by a substance that is emitted from the male organ, i.e., *ziva*. The Gemara raises a difficulty with regard to Rav’s derivation: And is it correct that anywhere that the phrase “both male and female” is written in the Torah, this comes to exclude a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite**? But isn’t a similar expression stated with regard to valuations, as it is written: “For the male…fifty shekels of silver, after the shekel of the Sanctuary. And if she is a female, then your valuation shall be thirty shekels” (Leviticus 27:3–4). And it is taught in a *baraita* that it is derived from the term “the male”: But not a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. One might have thought that a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite** shall not be valuated according to the valuation of a man, which is fifty shekels, but shall be valuated according to the valuation of a woman, which is thirty shekels. Therefore, the verse states: “The male,” and the following verse states: “And if she is a female,” indicating that these halakhot apply only to a definite male or a definite female, but not to a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. The Gemara explains the difficulty: The reason a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** are excluded is that it is written: “The male…and if she is a female,” which indicates that if the verse had written: Male and female, without the superfluous words “the” and “if,” it would not have been derived that the verse excludes a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite**. This apparently contradicts the opinion of Rav, who excludes a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** from the prohibition of entering the Temple in a state of impurity merely due to the phrase: “Male and female” (Numbers 5:3). The Gemara answers: In that verse with regard to valuations, the words “male” and “female” are themselves necessary in order to differentiate between the valuation of a man and the valuation of a woman. Therefore, it could not have been derived from that verse that a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite** are excluded from the *halakha* of valuations, were it not for the superfluous words ‘the’ and ‘if’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.28b.16?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 28b:16-29a:1)

(206, 207, 208) “The Gemara answers: In their opinion, that expression is necessary to include the birth of a child whose **sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*] or a hermaphrodite**. As it might enter your mind to say that as the words “male” (Leviticus 12:2) and “female” (Leviticus 12:5) are written in the passage, these *halakhot* apply only to a definite male and a definite female, but not to a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite**. Therefore, the term “she gives birth” teaches us that it is the birth itself, not the sex of the offspring, that matters. The Gemara asks: And from where does Rabbi Shimon derive that these *halakhot* apply to a ***tumtum*** and a **hermaphrodite**?”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.40a.7?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 40a:7-8)

(209) “All persons become unclean through zivah, even converts, even slaves whether freed or not, a deaf-mute, a person of unsound senses, and a minor, a **eunuch** whether [he had been castrated] by man, or was a **eunuch** from [the time of seeing] the sun. With regard to a **tumtum** and an **androgynous** [person], they place upon him the stringencies for a man and the stringencies for a woman: they defile through blood like a woman, and through eggy [substance] like a man.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Zavim.2.1?lang=en&sbsq=androgynous&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Zavim 2:1)

(210) “And one does not slaughter a ***tumtum***, whose sexual organs are concealed, and a **hermaphrodite [*ve’anderoginos*]**, which **has both male and female sexual organs**, neither in the Temple nor in the rest of the country. Rabbi Shimon says: You have no blemish greater than that, and it may be slaughtered. And the Rabbis say: The halakhic status of a h**ermaphrodite** is not that of a firstborn; rather, its halakhic status is that of a non-sacred animal that may be shorn and utilized for labor.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.41a.6?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 41a:6)

(211) “By contrast, Rabbi Yehuda’s explanation is reasonable, in that he adduces proof for his *halakha* from the case of a ***tumtum* and a hermaphrodite**, as even though they possess the presumed mental competence to make a commitment, nevertheless the Merciful One excludes them from being valuated.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Arakhin.5b.16?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Arakhin 5b:16)

(212) “It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Eliezer says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and an animal whose **sexual organs are indeterminate [*tumtum*]**, and an animal that is a **hermaphrodite [*ve’androginos*]** are neither sacred nor do they sanctify another animal.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.11a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 11a:9)

(213) “Rabbi Elazar says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and a ***tumtum*** animal, and a **hermaphrodite** animal are not sacred through consecration, and if they were sacred beforehand, e.g., one consecrated an animal and it subsequently became a *tereifa*, they do not sanctify non-sacred animals by means of substitution.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.17a.2?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 17a:2)

(214, 215, 216, 217, 218) “The mishna taught that Rabbi Elazar says: An animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a *tereifa*, and an animal born by caesarean section, and a ***tumtum*** animal, and a hermaphrodite animal, are neither sacred through consecration nor do they sanctify non-sacred animals by means of substitution. Shmuel says in explanation: They are not sanctified by substitution, i.e., if one said that an animal in any of these categories should be a substitute for a sacrificial animal, it does not become sanctified. And the clause that they do not sanctify non-sacred animals means that if one of these types of animal was sanctified and one attempted to render a non-sacred animal a substitute for it, that non-sacred animal does not become sanctified. It is taught in a *baraita* that Rabbi Meir said: But since these animals do not become sanctified, how can it even be suggested that they could sanctify another non-sacred animal? Rather, you find that the ruling of Rabbi Elazar applies only when one sanctifies an animal and afterward it became a *tereifa*, or when one sanctifies a fetus and it emerged from the womb by caesarean section. But with regard to an animal crossbred from diverse kinds, and a ***tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite**, you can find this ruling only in a case of the offspring of consecrated female animals, which have sanctity without an act of consecration. And this is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, who said that the offspring of a consecrated animal renders a non-sacred animal that is exchanged for it consecrated as a substitute. Rav Pappa said: What is the reason for the opinion of Rabbi Elazar? He holds that the *halakhot* of these categories of animal is like that of a non-kosher domesticated animal: Just as a non-kosher domesticated animal is not sacrificed as an offering and inherent sanctity does not rest upon it, so too, these animals in the categories of a *tereifa*, an animal born by caesarean section, **a *tumtum*, or a hermaphrodite** may not be sacrificed as offerings and inherent sanctity does not rest upon them. Rav Pappa said to Rava: But why aren’t animals in these categories compared to a blemished animal, which may not be sacrificed as an offering but nevertheless inherent sanctity does rest upon it? Rava said to Rav Pappa in response: Although a blemished animal is not sacrificed on the altar, another animal of its same type, i.e., an unblemished animal, is sacrificed as an offering. By contrast, an animal born by caesarean section, **a *tumtum*, and a hermaphrodite** may never be sacrificed. Rav Pappa said to Rava: If so, what will you say about a *tereifa*, as other

animals of its type are sacrificed. According to your explanation, why doesn't inherent sanctity rest upon a *tereifa*? Rather, Rava retracts his previous answer and instead says: The *halakhot* of animals in these categories are like those of a non-kosher domesticated animal, in the following manner: Just as the category of a non-kosher domesticated animal is an inherent disqualification, and such an animal cannot be sanctified or render another animal sanctified, so too the same applies to any other category of animal that is an inherent disqualification, such as a *tereifa*, an animal born by caesarean section, **a *tumtum* animal, and a hermaphrodite**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Temurah.17a.10?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Temurah 14a:10-14)

(219, 220, 221) "GEMARA: The Sages taught the following *baraita*: All are obligated to sound the *shofar*: Priests, Levites, and ordinary Israelites; converts; freed slaves; a ***tumtum***, i.e., one whose sexual organs from birth are concealed or are so undeveloped that it is impossible to determine whether the individual is male or female; a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, i.e., one with **both male and female reproductive organs**; and a half-slave, half-freeman. A ***tumtum*** who sounds the *shofar* cannot discharge the obligation of one of his kind, i.e., a fellow ***tumtum***, since men are bound by the obligation, whereas women are not, and it is possible that the sounder is female and the hearer is male, nor can he discharge the obligation of one who is not of his kind, an ordinary man or woman. A **hermaphrodite** can discharge the obligation of one of his kind, a fellow **hermaphrodite**, since if the sounder is treated as a female, the hearer is also considered a female, but he cannot discharge the obligation of one who is not of his kind."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Rosh_Hashanah.29a.9?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Rosh Hashanah 29a:9-10)

(222) "Rav Kahana, son of Rav Neḥemya, said: This would occur, for example, if the infant was a ***tumtum***, one whose external sexual organs are indeterminate and it is unclear whether the infant is male or female, and in the meantime between the time of the preparation of the Paschal lamb and the time of its eating, he was torn open, his gender was revealed, and he was found to be a male, so that the obligation to circumcise him went into effect."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.71b.6?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 71b:6)

(223, 224, 225, 226, 227, 228, 229, 230, 231, 232, 233, 234, 235, 236) "The Master said above in the *baraita*: A priest who is a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma*, but his wives [*nashav*] and slaves may partake of it. The Gemara is puzzled by this teaching: From where does a ***tumtum*** have wives? If he does not have a visible male organ, how can he marry a woman? If we say that he merely betrothed a woman, as it is taught in another *baraita*: If a ***tumtum*** betrothed a woman his betrothal is considered a valid betrothal, as he might be a male, and similarly if he was betrothed by a man, his betrothal is deemed a valid betrothal as he might be a female, there is a difficulty. One could say that the *tanna* said that the betrothal of a ***tumtum*** is valid only as a stringency, i.e., out of concern

that he might be a male, and therefore the woman cannot leave without a proper bill of divorce. But should we say that his betrothal is valid also as a leniency, to allow his wife to eat *teruma*? There is an uncertainty here that perhaps he is a woman, and one woman cannot betroth another woman. Abaye said: The *tanna* is referring to a ***tumtum*** whose male organ is hidden, but he is speaking of a situation where his testicles are visible externally. Since it is evident that he is a male, he can betroth a woman even though he cannot have relations with her. Rava said a different answer: What is meant here by the word *nashav,* which was translated earlier as his wives, but which can also be understood as his women? It refers here to the priest's mother, who, after her husband the priest has passed away, may continue to eat *teruma* by virtue of her son. The Gemara questions this interpretation of the *baraita*: His mother? It is obvious that she may eat *teruma* on his account, as he is her offspring by a priest. The Gemara explains: This statement is nevertheless necessary, lest you say that only if the priest is capable of having children does he enable his mother to eat *teruma*, but if he is incapable of having children he does not enable his mother to eat *teruma*, and therefore a ***tumtum***, who cannot have children, should not enable his mother to eat *teruma*. Therefore, the *tanna* teaches us that this is not so, as a woman may eat *teruma* by virtue of the child she bore a priest, even if that child is incapable of having children. Come and hear a proof in support of Abaye's opinion from that which is taught in the latter part of the *baraita*: A priest who is a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma* or sacrificial food. There is a difficulty here, as the *halakha* that a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma* was already taught in the first part of the *baraita*. Granted, according to Abaye, the *tanna* teaches in the first clause of the *baraita* the *halakha* governing a ***tumtum*** who is definitely uncircumcised, i.e., one whose testicles are visible externally, so that he is definitely male but cannot undergo circumcision because his member itself is hidden. And then he teaches in the latter clause of the *baraita* the *halakha* governing a ***tumtum*** about whom there is uncertainty as to whether he is uncircumcised, i.e., one whose genitalia are completely hidden, so that he might not even be a male. But according to Rava, why do I need the repetition of the *halakha* governing a ***tumtum*** in the latter clause? The *tanna* already stated this *halakha* in the first part of the *baraita*. The Gemara answers: What is this ***tumtum*** referred to in the latter clause? It is a man who is definitely uncircumcised. The Gemara asks: Now, if a ***tumtum***, about whom there is uncertainty as to whether he is uncircumcised, may not partake of *teruma*, as stated in the first clause of the *baraita*, can it be supposed that a man who is definitely uncircumcised may eat *teruma*, so that it was necessary for the *baraita* to teach in the latter clause that he may not do so? The Gemara answers: He is saying: What is the reason. The *baraita* should be understood as follows: What is the reason that a ***tumtum*** may not partake of *teruma*? It is because there is uncertainty as to whether he is uncircumcised, and an uncircumcised priest may not partake of *teruma* or sacrificial food."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.72a.12?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 72a:12-18)

(237, 238, 239, 240, 241, 242, 243, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248) “It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: If a ***tumtum***, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform *ḥalitza* because he is treated like a **eunuch**. Rabbi Ami said: What would Rabbi Yehuda do with the ***tumtum*** living in the town of Biri, who was placed in a seat for an operation, and the tissue covering his genitals was torn open and he later fathered seven children? Evidently, a ***tumtum*** who was torn open is not necessarily sexually impotent. The Gemara answers that Rabbi Yehuda could have said to you: Go and inquire about his children and find out from where they came. He did not believe that they were fathered by this man but rather by someone else. It is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: A ***tumtum*** must not perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a **eunuch by natural causes**. The Gemara asks: Why did he formulate his teaching in this manner? Is that to say that every ***tumtum*** who is torn open is a male? It is certainly possible for a ***tumtum*** to be found to be a female. The Gemara explains: This is what he said: A ***tumtum*** must not perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a female, who certainly cannot perform *ḥalitza*, and even if he is found to be a male, perhaps he will be found to be a **eunuch by natural causes**. The Gemara asks: What is the practical halakhic difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei? Rava said: There is a practical difference between them as to whether the *ḥalitza* performed by a ***tumtum*** disqualifies the brothers in a case where there are other brothers in addition to the ***tumtum***. According to Rabbi Yehuda, a ***tumtum*** is regarded as definitely sexually impotent, and therefore his *ḥalitza* is of no consequence. Therefore, if the ***tumtum*** went ahead and performed *ḥalitza*, he has not disqualified the other brothers from performing levirate marriage. According to Rabbi Yosei, however, he is only doubtfully sexually impotent, and therefore he has disqualified the other brothers from performing levirate marriage. And there is also a difference between them as to whether the ***tumtum*** must perform *ḥalitza* where there are no other brothers besides him.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.83b.6?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 83b:6-8)

(249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 256, 257, 258, 259, 260, 261, 262, 263, 264, 265, 266, 267, 268, 269, 270, 271, 272, 273, 274, 275, 276, 277, 278) MISHNA: With regard to one who left behind sons and daughters and a ***tumtum***, whose halakhic status as male or female is indeterminate, the *halakha* is as follows: When the estate is large the males direct the ***tumtum*** to the females and exclude him from the inheritance, claiming that perhaps the ***tumtum*** is female. When the estate is small, the females direct the ***tumtum*** to the males and exclude him from receiving sustenance, claiming that perhaps the ***tumtum*** is male. With regard to one who says: If my wife gives birth to a male the offspring shall receive a gift of one hundred dinars, if she in fact gave birth to a male, the offspring receives one hundred dinars. If he says: If my wife gives birth to a female the offspring shall receive a gift of two hundred dinars, if she in fact gave birth to a female, the offspring receives two hundred dinars. If he says: If my wife gives birth to a male the offspring shall receive a gift of one hundred dinars and if she gives birth to a female the offspring shall receive a gift of two hundred dinars, and in fact she gave birth to both a male and a female, the male offspring receives one hundred dinars and the female offspring receives two hundred dinars. If she gave birth to a ***tumtum***, the ***tumtum*** does not receive anything. If he said: Whatever offspring my wife gives birth

to shall receive a gift of a certain sum, and she gave birth to a ***tumtum***, the ***tumtum*** receives it. And if there is no heir other than the ***tumtum***, the ***tumtum*** inherits all of the estate. GEMARA: The mishna states that the males direct the ***tumtum*** to the females. The Gemara asks: Does this mean that they direct him, and he takes sustenance like a daughter? Isn't it taught in the latter clause of the mishna that if one said that either his male or female child will receive a certain sum once his wife gives birth, and she gave birth to a ***tumtum***, the ***tumtum*** does not receive anything? This indicates that the ***tumtum*** does not have the rights of a female. Abaye says: The mishna means that they direct him to the females, but he has no rights to sustenance. And Rava says: They direct him to the females and he has a right to sustenance. And with regard to the latter clause of the mishna, which grants the ***tumtum*** nothing at all, there we arrive at the opinion of Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel, as it is taught in a mishna (*Temura* 24b): If one consecrates a firstborn animal while it is still a fetus, stating that if it is male it shall be a burnt-offering and if it is female it shall be a peace-offering, and the mother gave birth to a ***tumtum*** or a **hermaphrodite [*androginos*]**, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: It is not imbued with sanctity, as it is neither male nor female. So too, in the case discussed in the mishna here, Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel maintains that the ***tumtum*** receives nothing, as he is considered to be a distinct entity of indeterminate sex, neither male nor female. The Gemara raises an objection from a *baraita*: A ***tumtum*** inherits as a son and is sustained as a daughter. Granted, according to Rava, the *baraita* can be explained to mean that the clause: Inherits as a son, is in the case of a small estate, as the daughters direct the ***tumtum*** to the sons, and just as there is no inheritance for the sons, there is none for the ***tumtum*** either. And the clause: And is sustained as a daughter, is in the case of a large estate, as the sons direct the ***tumtum*** to the daughters, and the ***tumtum*** receives sustenance along with them. But according to the opinion of Abaye, what does it mean that the ***tumtum*** is sustained as a daughter, since Abaye maintains that the ***tumtum*** does not have the rights of a daughter? The Gemara responds: And according to your reasoning, even according to Rava, what does it mean that a ***tumtum*** inherits as a son, since Rava concedes that the ***tumtum*** and sons do not actually inherit anything? Rather, the *baraita* means that it is fitting for the ***tumtum*** to inherit but he does not actually inherit. Here too, with regard to sustenance, according to Abaye, the *baraita* means that it is fitting for the ***tumtum*** to be sustained, but he is not actually sustained.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.140b.4?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 140b:4-141a:1)

(279, 280, 281, 282) “The Gemara rejects this explanation as well: If that is so, then concerning that which the last clause of the mishna teaches: And if there is no heir other than the ***tumtum***, the ***tumtum*** inherits all of the estate, if the mishna is referring to one who said: I shall give a certain sum to whoever informs me, what is the purpose of mentioning an heir, since the mishna is not discussing a gift to the heir at all? The Gemara proposes another resolution to Rav Naḥman’s objection: But let Rav Huna say to Rav Naḥman: The mishna is referring to a case where the gift was made after his wife had already given birth but he did not yet know the sex of the baby. The Gemara rejects this explanation as well: If that is so, then concerning that which the latter clause of the mishna teaches: Whatever offspring my wife gives birth to shall receive a certain sum, and she gave birth to a ***tumtum***, the ***tumtum*** receives it, there is a difficulty.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.141b.12?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 141b:12-13)

(283, 284) “Rather, it must be that the uncertainty in the case of the sounding of the shofar concerns whether a particular individual is a man or a woman, e.g., a ***tumtum***, whose sexual organs are indeterminate. Although a woman is not obligated in the mitzva of sounding the shofar, a ***tumtum*** is in fact obligated, despite the uncertainty of sex.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Chullin.85a.1?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Chullin 85a:1)

(285) “Ravina said: And even according to what the Sages said, that a woman may not sound the shofar on Rosh HaShana but a ***tumtum*** is nevertheless obligated due to uncertainty, there is a refutation to their claim as well.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Chullin.85a.4?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Chullin 85a:4)

(286) “And there is also a practical difference between their opinions with regard to performing *ḥalitza* with the widow in a case where there are no brothers other than this ***tumtum***.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.43a.2?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 43a:2)

(287, 288, 289, 290, 291, 292, 293, 294, 295, 296, 297, 298, 299, 300, 301, 302, 303, 304, 305) “With regard to these two baraitot, the Sages assumed that everyone holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who says: A **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, i.e., one who was entirely lacking in sexual capacity from birth, does not perform ḥalitza and does not enter into levirate marriage with his sister-in-law, as he is not included in the mitzva of levirate marriage. Likewise, if he died his brothers do not perform ḥalitza with his wife, and they may not enter into levirate marriage with her, as she is forbidden to them as a brother’s wife who does not require levirate marriage. Based on this assumption, the Gemara suggests: What, is it not that the two

baraitot disagree about this, that the one who says that a **tumtum** performs ḥalitza and one of the brothers performs ḥalitza with the wife of the **tumtum** or enters into levirate marriage with the wife of the **tumtum** holds that we do not say that since this **tumtum** has changed from an average person, he might also have changed in that he is a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and therefore the brothers would be prohibited from entering into levirate marriage with the wife? Rather, if the **tumtum** is a male, it is assumed that he is capable of fathering children, and consequently his wife requires levirate marriage. And the one who says that the wife of a **tumtum** performs ḥalitza and does not enter into levirate marriage maintains that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, i.e., the possibility that he might be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** is considered, and therefore his wife may not enter into levirate marriage. The Gemara responds: No; everyone agrees that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, and there is a concern that he might be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Rather, the difference between the rulings is that this baraita, which permits the wife of the **tumtum** to enter levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who disagrees with Rabbi Akiva and maintains that levirate marriage may be performed with the wife of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and that baraita, which prohibits levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, that the brothers of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** do not enter into levirate marriage with the wife of the **tumtum**. The Gemara asks: And who is the tanna who holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva that the wife of a **eunuch** whose condition is caused naturally does not require levirate marriage, and yet he maintains that the wife of a **tumtum** must perform ḥalitza? If we say it is Rabbi Yehuda, this cannot be, as in his opinion even if the genitals of a **tumtum** were revealed and he was found to be a male, he deems him like a definite **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** and therefore his wife does not require ḥalitza at all. As we learned in a mishna (Yevamot 81a) that Rabbi Yehuda says: With regard to a **tumtum** who was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Just as this **tumtum** does not perform ḥalitza, so too, his widow does not require ḥalitza. Rather, it is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that if a **tumtum** was torn open and he was found to be a male, he is considered as a matter of uncertainty to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and consequently his wife requires ḥalitza. As it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: A **tumtum** does not perform ḥalitza with the wife of his late, childless brother if there are other brothers to perform ḥalitza, as perhaps the skin covering his genitals will be torn open and he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** and the widow would not be released from the levirate bond by his ḥalitza. According to this opinion, it is not certain that a **tumtum** would be found to be a eunuch whose condition is caused naturally. With regard to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, the Gemara asks: Why does this individual not perform ḥalitza due only to the possibility that he will be found to be a eunuch whose condition is caused naturally? Is that to say that every **tumtum** whose skin was torn is found to be a male and is not found to be a female? The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, said his opinion in the formulation of: Perhaps, which includes multiple uncertainties: A **tumtum** must not perform ḥalitza, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a female, who can certainly not perform ḥalitza. Alternatively, if he is found to be a male, he may also not perform ḥalitza, since perhaps he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally.** The Gemara asks:

Since both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, agree that a **tumtum** may not perform ḥalitza for his brother’s wife, what is the practical difference between their opinions? Rava said: There is a practical difference with regard to disqualifying the widow, through his ḥalitza, from entering into levirate marriage in a case where there are other brothers. According to Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that this individual is certainly a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** his ḥalitza is of no effect whatsoever, and therefore she may enter into levirate marriage with one of the other brothers. Conversely, according to Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, since it is possible that he is not a **eunuch** and his ḥalitza is valid, she is forbidden to the other brothers as their brother’s wife. And there is also a practical difference between their opinions with regard to performing ḥalitza with the widow in a case where there are no brothers other than this **tumtum**. According to Rabbi Yehuda, ḥalitza is not necessary in this case, as she requires ḥalitza only if her late husband had brothers who are obligated to perform levirate marriage, and this individual is definitely a **eunuch** whose condition is caused naturally. By contrast, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, maintains that he must perform ḥalitza with her, in case he is a male and not a **eunuch**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.42b.10?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 42b:10-43a:2)

305 total mentions

Aylonit

Note: “Barren woman” and “Sexually underdeveloped” are also synonymous terms for Aylonit so they are included.

(1) “I have already revealed to you last Shabbat concerning your first two wives. Now I have come to reveal to you the secret of your third wife. You should know that this woman was in the past, a proper Torah scholar. However, he was stingy with his money and would not give charity. He was also stingy with his wisdom and would not teach others. **He was therefore punished that his soul migrated into a woman, measure for measure. Therefore, his soul was incarnated into a female**, who is constantly receiving and needs someone to bequeath to her. Therefore you see, that she does abundant charity and loves you very much because you work to spread Torah and toil in writing books to teach others…because these things bring about the rectification of her soul, she therefore loves you… **It is because she has the soul of a male** that you have not had children from her, because a male and another male cannot produce offspring. If you shall point out that she has children from her first husband, this is because **the first husband has the spark of a female soul within him…**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Maggid_Meisharim.8.3?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Maggid Meisharim 8:3)

(2) “Rabbi Meir said to them: A boy minor may not perform levirate marriage lest he be found to be a **eunuch,** i.e., one who is incapable of fathering children for his late brother. Similarly, a girl minor may not perform levirate marriage lest **she be found to be sexually underdeveloped** when she grows up.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.61b.6?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 61b:6)

(3, 4) “A **sexually underdeveloped man** does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with his yevama. And similarly, a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]**, who is incapable of bearing children, does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with her yavam. If a **sexually underdeveloped man** performed ḥalitza with his yevama, he has not thereby disqualified her from marrying into the priesthood, as his ḥalitza is invalid. However, if he had intercourse with her, he has disqualified her. This is because it is considered licentious sexual intercourse, since such intercourse does not fulfill the mitzva of levirate marriage and is therefore categorized as forbidden relations with one’s sister-in-law. And similarly, with regard to a **sexually underdeveloped woman,** if one of the brothers performed ḥalitza with her he has not thereby disqualified her from marrying into the priesthood.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.79b.7?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 79b:7-8)

(5) “And the Gemara raises a contradiction against this from the following source: With regard to a man twenty years old who has not developed two pubic hairs, they must bring proof that he is twenty years old, and he is established as a **eunuch**, who may neither perform ḥalitza nor perform levirate marriage. Likewise, in the case of a woman who is twenty years old and has not developed two pubic hairs, they must bring proof that she is twenty years old, and that she is a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, who may neither perform ḥalitza nor enter into levirate marriage. This shows that the status of a nine-year-old male and a twenty-year old man without pubic hairs are not the same, as the intercourse of a nine-year-old is considered of some significance, whereas that of a **eunuch** is entirely disregarded, as he may not even perform ḥalitza. The Gemara answers: Wasn’t it stated with regard to this baraita that Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak said that Rav said: And this halakha applies only if he developed other signs of a **eunuch** by the age of twenty. The mishna, by contrast, is referring to one who merely showed the signs of maturity at a late age. Rava said: The language of the baraita is also precise, as it teaches: And he is the eunuch. One can learn from here that this is referring to one who is definitely a **eunuch**. The Gemara asks a question with regard to the halakha itself: And in a case where he does not develop the signs of a **eunuch**, until what age is he considered a minor? The school of Rabbi Ḥiyya taught: Until most of his years have passed, i.e., until he reaches the age of thirty-five, i.e., halfway to seventy, the standard length of a man’s life. On the same issue, the Gemara relates: When they would come before Rava to inquire about someone who had reached the age of maturity but had not yet developed the physical signs, if the person in question was thin, he would say to them: Go and fatten him up before we decide on his status. And if he was fat, he would say to them: Go and make him thin. As these signs, the pubic hairs of maturity, sometimes they fall off due to thinness and sometimes they fall off due to fatness. It is therefore possible that after his bodily shape is adjusted he will develop the signs of maturity and will not have the status of a **eunuch**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.97a.3?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 97a:3-7)

(6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12) “A **eunuch** is not impaired in a single organ; rather, he has a defect that affects his entire body. Consequently, there is no concern that, though he was born with the defect and presently suffers from it, he might have regained his potency for some time in the middle. It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: No; rather, a **eunuch by natural causes** performs ḥalitza, whereas a **eunuch** caused by man does not perform ḥalitza. The Gemara raises a contradiction from the following mishna (Nidda 47b): If a twenty-year-old man has not grown two pubic hairs, a sign of sexual maturity, the relatives of the widow who wish to exempt her from ḥalitza and levirate marriage must bring proof that he is twenty years old, and he, having been established as a **sexually underdeveloped man**, does not perform ḥalitza or levirate marriage with his yevama. If a twenty-year-old woman has not grown two pubic hairs, the relatives of her deceased husband’s brother must bring proof that she is twenty years old, and she, having been established as a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with her yavam. This is the statement of Beit Hillel. And Beit Shammai say: With regard to both this and that, males and females, the relevant age is eighteen years old, not twenty. The mishna continues: Rabbi Eliezer says that for a male the halakha is in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel, and for a female the halakha is in accordance with the statement of Beit Shammai, because a woman reaches maturity more quickly than does a man, and therefore, if she fails to develop the signs of maturity by the age of eighteen it is assumed that she is a **sexually underdeveloped woman**. In any case, it is clear from this mishna that even Rabbi Eliezer agrees that one who lacks sexual capacity from birth may neither perform ḥalitza nor enter into levirate marriage. Rami bar Dikulei said that Shmuel said: Rabbi Eliezer retracted his opinion. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Which statement did he retract? Did he retract what he said here in the mishna, that a **eunuch by natural causes** performs ḥalitza with his yevama and his brothers perform ḥalitza with his wife? Alternatively, perhaps the mishna here reflects his final view, after he retracted what he said in the other mishna. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this question, as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: A **eunuch by natural causes** performs ḥalitza with his yevama and his brothers perform ḥalitza with his wife, as such type of men are cured in Alexandria of Egypt. This additional source and its reasoning suggest that Rabbi Eliezer did not retract what he said in the mishna here. Rather, he retracted his statement with regard to the dispute between Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai in the other mishna. Rabbi Elazar says: Actually, he did not retract anything at all. And when we learned Rabbi Eliezer’s ruling in that mishna with regard to the age of a **sexually underdeveloped individual**, that ruling was stated with regard to punishments, i.e., the age at which such an individual is considered an adult so that he is liable to receive punishment, and not with regard to ḥalitza or levirate marriage. And it was stated that the amora’im disagreed on this issue: With regard to one who ate forbidden fats or performed any other transgression for which one is liable to receive lashes or karet, when he was between the age of twelve years and one day and the age of eighteen years, and he developed the signs of one who was a **eunuch by natural causes**, as explained below, and afterward he grew two pubic hairs, Rav said: He is retroactively considered a **eunuch by natural causes**. In other words, these hairs are not viewed as a sign of maturity. Rather, he lacked sexual capacity from the outset, which means he became an adult at the standard age of thirteen and is held liable for his actions from that point in time. And Shmuel said: No, he was a minor at the time he committed his offense, as the two hairs are a sign of his maturity, albeit delayed. Rav Yosef strongly objects to this: If so, according to Rav, a sexually underdeveloped woman according to Rabbi Meir should be entitled to the fine paid by a

rapist. Rabbi Meir maintains that a rapist is liable to be fined only if he raped a young woman between the ages of twelve and twelve and a half, but not if he raped a minor. And furthermore, a sexually underdeveloped woman is not entitled to the fine because she is considered a minor, as she never showed the signs of maturity. But according to Rav she should retroactively be viewed as an adult and would therefore be entitled to the fine. Abaye said to him: A **sexually underdeveloped woman** passes directly from minority to full adulthood. In other words, she is first considered a minor and then immediately an adult, without passing through the intermediate stage of young womanhood, and an adult woman is not entitled to the rapist's fine. Greatly impressed with this answer, Rav Yosef said to Abaye: Would that all such excellent matters be stated in my name. As it is taught in a baraita: A **sexually underdeveloped man** is not judged as a stubborn and rebellious son, as a boy is judged as a stubborn and rebellious son only when he has the mark of his lower beard, i.e., when his pubic hair begins to grow in. At that point he has reached the age of maturity but is not yet a fully developed man, a stage that parallels young womanhood for women. A **sexually underdeveloped man** never passes through this intermediate stage between minority and full adulthood. And similarly, a **sexually underdeveloped woman** who was betrothed and raped is not judged in accordance with the laws governing a betrothed young woman (see Deuteronomy 22:23–27), as she passes directly from minority to full adulthood without the intermediate stage of young womanhood. Therefore, the baraita fully corroborates Abaye's view. Rabbi Abbahu said: If one has the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man**; or the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**; or the signs of a child born during the eighth month of pregnancy, whose survival is uncertain; no action is taken in their regard, i.e., the **sexually underdeveloped male or female** is not treated as an adult and the child born during the eighth month is not deemed viable, until they are twenty years old."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.80a.5?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 80a:5-14)

(13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20) "The Sages taught: Who is considered a **eunuch by natural causes?** It is anyone who is twenty years old and has not yet grown two pubic hairs. And even if he grows pubic hairs afterward, he is still considered a **eunuch by natural causes** with regard to all his matters. And his signs are as follows: Whoever does not have a beard, and his hair is defective, unlike that of ordinary individuals, and his skin is smooth, i.e., hairless. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says in the name of Rabbi Yehuda ben Ya'ir: It is anyone whose urine does not raise foam. And some say: It is anyone who urinates without forming an arch. And some say: It is anyone whose semen dissipates and fails to congeal in the proper manner. And some say: Anyone whose urine does not ferment. Others say: It is anyone who bathes in the rainy season and his flesh does not give off steam. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: It is anyone whose voice is defective, so that it is not evident from it whether he is a man or a woman. And who is a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]?** It is anyone who is twenty years old and has not yet grown two pubic hairs. And even if she grows pubic hairs afterward, she is still considered a **sexually underdeveloped woman** with regard to all her matters. And her signs are as follows: A **sexually underdeveloped woman** is anyone who does not have breasts and experiences pain during intercourse. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: It is anyone whose lower abdomen is not formed like that of other women, as she lacks the cushion of flesh that is usually situated above a woman's genitals. Rabbi Shimon ben

Elazar says: It is anyone whose voice is deep, so that it is not evident from it whether she is a woman or a man. It was stated that amora'im disagreed over the signs of a **eunuch**. Rav Huna said that one is not categorized as a **eunuch** unless all these signs are present; Rabbi Yoḥanan said: He is categorized as such even if only one of them is present. The Gemara comments: In a case when he has grown two hairs in his beard, everyone agrees that he is not considered sexually impotent unless all the signs are present. When they disagree, it is with regard to a case when he has not grown two hairs. The Gemara asks: But if so, with regard to that which Rabba bar Avuh said to the Sages: Examine Rav Naḥman when he bathes and if his flesh gives off steam I will give him my daughter for a wife, in accordance with whose opinion did he issue these instructions? Is it not in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, who maintains that all the signs must be present, as presumably he could see that Rav Naḥman did not have a beard? The Gemara answers: No, Rav Naḥman had wisps of a beard, and therefore Rabba bar Avuh wanted to know whether he displayed the other signs of sexual incapacity. It is taught in the mishna that a **sexually underdeveloped man** does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with his yevama, and similarly, a **sexually underdeveloped woman** does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with her yavam. The Gemara comments that the tanna teaches the case of a **sexually underdeveloped man** similarly to that of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, from which it can be inferred: Just as in the case of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, her disability is by the hand of Heaven, so too, in the case of a **sexually underdeveloped man**, his disability must be by the hand of Heaven. And this unattributed view in the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said: With regard to one whose incapacity was brought about by the hands of man, yes, he is considered like any other man and performs ḥalitza, whereas one who suffers his condition by the hand of Heaven does not do so. It is further taught in the mishna that if a **eunuch** performed ḥalitza with his yevama, he has not thereby disqualified her from marrying into the priesthood, but if he had intercourse with her, he has disqualified her. The Gemara infers from this wording that the reason for her disqualification is that he, the yavam, had intercourse with her, as she had intercourse with her yavam outside the framework of permitted levirate marriage. But if a different individual had relations with her she would not be disqualified. Shall we say that this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Hamnuna, who said: A widow waiting for her yavam, who engaged in an act of licentious relations, is disqualified from entering into levirate marriage with her yavam, like an ordinary married woman who committed adultery? The Gemara rejects this argument: No, this presents no difficulty for Rav Hamnuna, as it is possible that the same is true even in a case where she had relations with a different man, that she too would be disqualified from marrying into the priesthood. But since the tanna taught the first clause with regard to the yavam himself, he also taught the latter clause with regard to the yavam himself, even though the same halakha applies if she cohabitated with another. It is taught in the mishna: And similarly, with regard to a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, if one of the brothers performed ḥalitza with her he has not disqualified her, but if he engaged in intercourse with her he has disqualified her. The Gemara infers from this wording that the reason for her disqualification is that he had intercourse with her; but if he did not have intercourse with her she is not disqualified. According to whose opinion was this clause of the mishna taught? One must say that it was not taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. As, if one would claim that this teaching is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't he say that a **sexually underdeveloped woman** is considered like a woman who has had sexual relations with a man forbidden to her by the Torah [zona], and so she is in any case disqualified from marrying into

the priesthood? MISHNA: If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yehuda says: If a **tumtum, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.80b.4?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 80b:4-81a:4)

(21) "And the Gemara raises a contradiction against this from the following source: With regard to a man twenty years old who has not developed two pubic hairs, they must bring proof that he is twenty years old, and he is established as a **eunuch**, who may neither perform ḥalitza nor perform levirate marriage. Likewise, in the case of a woman who is twenty years old and has not developed two pubic hairs, they must bring proof that she is twenty years old, and that she is a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, who may neither perform ḥalitza nor enter into levirate marriage. This shows that the status of a nine-year-old male and a twenty-year old man without pubic hairs are not the same, as the intercourse of a nine-year-old is considered of some significance, whereas that of a **eunuch** is entirely disregarded, as he may not even perform ḥalitza. The Gemara answers: Wasn't it stated with regard to this baraita that Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak said that Rav said: And this halakha applies only if he developed other signs of a **eunuch** by the age of twenty. The mishna, by contrast, is referring to one who merely showed the signs of maturity at a late age. Rava said: The language of the baraita is also precise, as it teaches: And he is the eunuch. One can learn from here that this is referring to one who is definitely a **eunuch**. The Gemara asks a question with regard to the halakha itself: And in a case where he does not develop the signs of a **eunuch**, until what age is he considered a minor? The school of Rabbi Ḥiyya taught: Until most of his years have passed, i.e., until he reaches the age of thirty-five, i.e., halfway to seventy, the standard length of a man's life. On the same issue, the Gemara relates: When they would come before Rava to inquire about someone who had reached the age of maturity but had not yet developed the physical signs, if the person in question was thin, he would say to them: Go and fatten him up before we decide on his status. And if he was fat, he would say to them: Go and make him thin. As these signs, the pubic hairs of maturity, sometimes they fall off due to thinness and sometimes they fall off due to fatness. It is therefore possible that after his bodily shape is adjusted he will develop the signs of maturity and will not have the status of a **eunuch**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.97a.3?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 97a:3-7)

(22) "Rabbi Meir prohibits this lest the **boy turn out to be a eunuch or the girl turn out to be sexually underdeveloped.**"

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.111b.13?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 111b:13)

(23, 24, 25) “Or if those women were divorced by their husband, the deceased brother, or were found to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]**, i.e., a woman who is so underdeveloped that she is not considered a woman in the full sense, these halakhot do not apply. Her marriage is considered a mistaken marriage and is null and void. In all these cases their rival wives are permitted, as the exemption for rival wives of forbidden relatives applies only when the forbidden relative was the brother’s wife at the time of his death, when the halakhot of levirate marriage came into effect. And the mishna comments that the language of this principle is imprecise, as you cannot say with regard to his mother-in-law and with regard to his mother-in-law’s mother and with regard to his father-in-law’s mother that they were found to be an **aylonit**, as an **aylonit** is sterile and therefore cannot become a mother or a mother-in-law.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.2b.3?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 2b:3-4)

(26, 27, 28, 29) “Rav Asi said: The rival wife of a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]** is forbidden. In other words, if one of the wives of the deceased brother was an **aylonit**, who is incapable of giving birth, the mitzva of levirate marriage does not apply. As it is stated with regard to a woman who requires levirate marriage: “The firstborn that she bears” (Deuteronomy 25:6), which comes to exclude an **aylonit**, who cannot give birth. Since the halakhot of levirate marriage do not apply to an **aylonit**, she retains her status as a brother’s wife who is forbidden, and therefore her rival wife is also exempt from levirate marriage.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.12a.14?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 12a:14)

(30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35) “Rather, the case of Rabban Gamliel’s daughter is different, as she was a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]**, and therefore the prohibition against marrying her rival wife does not apply, as explicitly stated in the mishna. The Gemara asks: But from the fact that it is taught in the latter clause of the same baraita: Others say that Rabban Gamliel’s daughter was an **aylonit**, it can be derived by inference that the first tanna holds that she was not an **aylonit**. The Gemara answers: The dispute between the tanna’im was not about whether or not she was an **aylonit**, as she certainly was. Rather, the practical difference between them is whether he knew that she was an **aylonit** at the time of marriage and decided to marry her regardless. Some maintain in general that if the husband was aware of her condition prior to marriage, her rival wife is forbidden, but if he did not know about her status, the rival wife is permitted. And if you wish, say that the practical difference between them concerns a different case, that of one who married and ultimately divorced. This is referring to an issue discussed above of whether a woman is considered the rival wife of a forbidden relation simply by virtue of her marriage to the specific man or whether she must be married to him at the time when the mitzva of levirate obligation takes effect, i.e., at the time of the brother’s death. And if you wish, say that the practical difference between them concerns a case where there is a condition in sexual relations. In other words, the first tanna holds that Rabban Gamliel’s daughter was married only conditionally, and since the condition was never fulfilled the marriage was nullified. Consequently, Rabban Gamliel could marry the other wife regardless of his daughter’s status as an **aylonit**, as she was never married to his brother at all. However, according to the other tanna, even if the marriage was dependent upon a condition that was not fulfilled, because the man engaged in sexual relations with her the act of intercourse itself serves to nullify the condition. Accordingly, he maintains that the only reason Rabban Gamliel could enter into levirate marriage with his daughter’s rival wife was not because of the condition, but due to the fact that his daughter was an **aylonit**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.15a.9?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 15a:9-12)

(36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41) “Rafram bar Pappa said: It comes to include the case of a rival wife of a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]**, who is incapable of bearing children. Not only does an **aylonit** herself not enter into levirate marriage, since she is unable to give birth, but her rival wife is exempt as well. And this is like the principle of Rav Asi, who said that the rival wife of an **aylonit** is forbidden because the **aylonit** herself remains prohibited to the yavam as the wife of his brother, as she was never rendered permitted by the obligation of levirate marriage. Therefore, her rival wife is the rival wife of someone prohibited as a forbidden relation. And there are those who say that Rafram bar Pappa’s statement was made in a different context. It was taught in the mishna: Whoever is forbidden to her yavam by a prohibition of forbidden relations is completely exempt, which implies that it is specifically in such a case that her rival wife is forbidden. But any case when one wife is not forbidden by a prohibition of forbidden relations but is instead forbidden for some other reason, then her rival wife is not forbidden. This case comes to exclude what? Rafram said: It excludes the rival wife of an **aylonit**, who requires levirate marriage or ḥalitza because the **aylonit** is not prohibited as a forbidden relation. And this statement is not in accordance with the opinion of Rav Asi.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.20a.9?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 20a:9-10)

(42) “Or a woman who could not be pregnant because she miscarried after her husband’s death, or because she was barren, or elderly, or a minor, or a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]**, or if for some other reason she was unsuited to give birth; even though the reason for the decree to wait three months does not apply to such a woman, nevertheless, she must wait three months.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.42b.6?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 42b:6)

(43, 44, 45, 46, 47) “MISHNA: A common priest may not marry a **sexually underdeveloped woman [*aylonit*]**, who is incapable of bearing children, unless he already has a wife and children. Rabbi Yehuda says: Even if he has a wife and children, he may not marry a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, as she is the *zona* about whom it is stated in the Torah that a priest may not marry her. Intercourse with her is considered a licentious act because she is incapable of bearing children. And the Rabbis say: The only women in the category of *zona*, who are therefore forbidden to a priest, are a female convert, a freed maidservant, and any woman who engaged in licentious sexual intercourse with a man she is prohibited from marrying. GEMARA: The Exilarch said to Rav Huna: What is the reason for the *halakha* that a priest may not marry a **sexually underdeveloped woman?** It is because he is obligated to fulfill the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply. Is it only priests who were commanded to be fruitful and multiply, but Israelites were not commanded? Why does the mishna specify that a priest may not marry a **sexually underdeveloped woman**? Rav Huna said to him: This halakha does in fact apply even to Israelites, and the tanna mentions priests because he wants to teach it in a way that would parallel the latter clause of the mishna, which states that Rabbi Yehuda says: Even if he has a wife and he has children, he may not marry a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, as she is the zona about whom it is stated in the Torah that a priest may not marry her.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.61a.13?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 61a:12-61b:1)

(48) “Rabbi Yehuda says: A zona is a sexually underdeveloped woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.61b.8?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 61b:8)

(49) “Rabbi Yitzḥak said: For what reason were our forefathers initially infertile? Because the Holy One, Blessed be He, desires the prayers of the righteous, and He therefore wanted them to pray for children. Similarly, Rabbi Yitzḥak said: Why are the prayers of the righteous compared to a pitchfork [eter], as in the verse: “And He let Himself be entreated [vaye’ater]”? This indicates that just as this pitchfork turns over produce from one place to another, so the prayer of the righteous turns over the attributes of the Holy One, Blessed be He, from the attribute of rage to the attribute of mercy. Rabbi Ami said: **Abraham and Sarah were originally tumtumin, people whose sexual organs are concealed and not functional**, as it is stated: “Look to the rock from where you were hewn, and to the hole of the pit from where you were dug” (Isaiah 51:1), and it is written in the next verse: “Look to Abraham your father and to Sarah who bore you” (Isaiah 51:2), **which indicates that sexual organs were fashioned for them, signified by the words hewn and dug, over the course of time.** Rav Naḥman said that Rabba bar Avuh said: **Our mother Sarah was initially a sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit], as it is stated: “And Sarah was barren; she had no child”** (Genesis 11:30). The superfluous words: “She had no child,” **indicate that she did not have even a place, i.e., a womb, for a child.** Rav Yehuda, son of Rav Shmuel bar Sheilat, said in the name of Rav: They taught that he waits ten years only with regard to the people who lived in former generations, whose years were numerous, i.e., they lived longer. However, with regard to the people who live in later generations, whose years are few, he waits only two and half years before divorcing her, corresponding to the time period of three pregnancies. Rabba said in the name of Rav Naḥman: He waits three years, corresponding to the three remembrances of **barren women** by God, as the Master said: On Rosh HaShana Sarah, Rachel, and Hannah were remembered**,** i.e., God gave them children. Since God determines on Rosh HaShana whether **barren women** will conceive that year, one may remain married until three such opportunities have passed.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.64a.9?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 64a:9-64b:2)

(50, 51, 52) “And there is also a case in which they are forbidden to these and to those, namely if they married **sexually underdeveloped women [ayloniot].** If an Egyptian married an **aylonit**, she is forbidden to him as a Jewish woman, and she is forbidden to his brother, a third-generation Egyptian convert who is permitted to marry a Jewish woman, because levirate marriage is prohibited with an **aylonit**. The fact that the mishna omits these cases appears to indicate that the halakha is not in accordance with Rabbi Yoḥanan. The Gemara answers: There is no proof from here with regard to the halakha, as the tanna of the mishna did not mention all possible examples. Rather, he taught certain cases and omitted others. The Gemara asks: What else did he omit that he omitted this? The tanna would not have omitted only one example. The Gemara answers: He omitted the case of a **man with crushed testicles** or with other wounds to his genitals. If the husband is such a man, the wife is forbidden to her husband and permitted to her yavam. If the yavam is such a man, the opposite is true. The Gemara asks: If this mishna is determined to have taught certain cases and omitted others due to the omission of the case of a **man with crushed testicles** or other wounds to his genitals, this is not an omission, as in this mishna the tanna taught a principle that applies to all forbidden relationships for which one is liable for violating a prohibition.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.84b.5?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 84b:5-7)

(53, 54, 55) “With regard to one who married his yevama, and the rival wife of the yevama went and married someone else, and this yevama was later discovered to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, which means that she was never eligible for levirate marriage and therefore her act of intercourse did not exempt her rival wife from levirate marriage, the rival wife must leave this one and that one, i.e., her husband must give her a bill of divorce and she may not marry the yavam, and all these matters apply to her. But why? Again, let us say: What could she have done. The Gemara answers: This is no proof, as she should have waited until it was clearly established that the other wife was not a **sexually underdeveloped woman**. Abaye said: Come and hear: With regard to all those with whom relations are forbidden, with regard to whom the Sages said that they exempt their rival wives, if these rival wives went and married, and one of these forbidden women was discovered to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, which means that the obligation of levirate marriage did not apply to her at all, and it was the rival wives who should have performed levirate marriage, the rival wife must leave both this and that, and all these matters apply to her.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.91b.5?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 91b:5-6)

(56) “With regard to a minor who refuses her husband and leaves him, and likewise a woman who is a secondary forbidden relative prohibited by rabbinic law, and a **sexually underdeveloped woman** who is incapable of bearing children, these women have no marriage contract.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.113a.6?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Yevamot 113a:6)

(57, 58) “He said to them: I am concerned about the minor boy, lest he be confirmed as a **sexually underdeveloped man** when he grows up, and I am concerned about the minor girl, lest she be confirmed as an **aylonit**, a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, when she grows up. Then levirate marriage would not apply, and they would end up encountering a forbidden relative if they consummated the levirate marriage. And the Rabbis hold: Follow the majority of minor boys, and most minor boys are not sexually underdeveloped when they grow up. Likewise, follow the majority of minor girls, and most minor girls are not in the category of **aylonit** when they grow up. This indicates that the Rabbis disagree with Rabbi Meir even with regard to a non-evident majority.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.119a.8?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 119a:8)

(59) “The next phrase: “That she bears,” is interpreted to exclude levirate marriage in the case of a widow who is an aylonit, who cannot bear children.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.24a.5?lang=bi&sbsq=aylonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 24a:5)

(60, 61, 62) “The Gemara continues to object: No woman should enter into levirate marriage; there should be a rabbinic decree due to the case of an **aylonit**. Since an **aylonit** may not enter into levirate marriage, all other women should be prohibited by rabbinic decree from doing so to avoid confusion. The Gemara answers: The case of an **aylonit** is not commonplace, and the Sages did not institute rabbinic decrees on matters that are not common.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.20b.13?lang=bi&sbsq=aylonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 20b:13)

(63, 64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73, 74, 75) “The Gemara analyzes Rav Yosef’s statement: The emphasis of: This is, which indicates that it applies to this case and no other, comes to exclude what? Doesn’t it come to exclude the rival wife of an **aylonit**, which would mean that she is permitted? Although an aylonit herself may marry any man, she is not suitable for levirate marriage. If so, Rav Yosef’s comment indicates that only a woman subject to a double levirate bond, not any other case, renders her rival wife forbidden merely by coming before the yavam for levirate marriage. The Gemara rejects this suggestion: No, Rav Yosef’s statement was meant to exclude the rival wife of an **aylonit**, that she is forbidden. And what is the meaning of: This is? It means that this is the one for whom coming before the yavam for levirate marriage caused her to be forbidden, and therefore her rival wife requires ḥalitza and is not entirely exempt. In contrast, in the case of the rival wife of an **aylonit**, she does not even require ḥalitza. What is the reason for this difference between the two cases? This one, an **aylonit**, is exempt from levirate marriage by Torah law, while this one, who was betrothed by levirate betrothal to the other brother, is forbidden by rabbinic law, and she therefore must perform ḥalitza. The Gemara cites another relevant source. We learned in the mishna: And with regard to all of these women with whom relations are forbidden, if they died, or they refused their husbands, or were divorced, or were found to be **aylonit**, their rival wives are permitted in levirate marriage. This ruling apparently contradicts the statement of Rav Asi that the rival wife of an **aylonit** is forbidden. The Gemara responds: This is not difficult. Here, Rav Asi is referring to a situation in which her husband knew that she was an **aylonit** prior to marriage, and as he married her regardless of her condition their marriage is fully valid. Since the mitzva of levirate marriage does not apply to her because she cannot give birth, her rival wife is also exempt. There, in the mishna, it is referring to a case where he did not know that she was an **aylonit** at the time of marriage, but only at a later stage. Since in this case it can be said that he would not choose to marry an **aylonit**, hers was a mistaken betrothal, and it is therefore nullified. Consequently, her rival wife is permitted. The Gemara comments: The language of the mishna is also precise, as it teaches: Were found to be an **aylonit**, and it does not teach: Were an **aylonit**. This indicates that her condition was not known to the husband at the time of marriage but was discovered by him only later. The Gemara summarizes: Conclude from this that this is the correct interpretation of the mishna. Consequently, the mishna does not contradict the opinion of Rav Asi. Rava said: And the halakha is that the rival wife of an aylonit is permitted, and this is the case even if her first husband knew of her status and her marriage was fully valid. The mitzva of levirate marriage does not apply to an aylonit, but her rival wife is not forbidden. And even in the case of the rival wife of his **aylonit** daughter who was recognized as such, the other wife is not considered the rival wife of a forbidden relative. The Gemara asks: However, with regard to that which the mishna teaches: Were found to be, from which it was inferred that there is a difference between an **aylonit** whose condition was known by the husband beforehand and one who was recognized by him only later, how is this to be explained? The Gemara answers that one should emend this and teach simply: That were, and not: Were found to be. When Ravin came from Eretz Yisrael he said that Rabbi Yoḥanan said: There is one halakha with regard to the rival wife of a girl who refused her husband, and the rival wife of an aylonit, and also the rival wife of one who remarries his divorcée: They are all permitted.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.12a.18?lang=bi&sbsq=aylonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 12a:18-12b:2)

(76) “Rav added the rival wife of a woman suspected by her husband of adultery [sota], while Rav Asi added the rival wife of an **aylonit**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.3b.1?lang=bi&sbsq=aylonit%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 3b:1)

(77) “However, the two cases cited by Rav and Rav Asi do not leave room for such deliberations, as both a sota and an **aylonit** are exempt and forbidden equally to all of the brothers, because their prohibition does not result from a familial relation to one of the living brothers but from a personal issue relating to the women themselves. Since none of the brothers may marry her rival wife, there is no possibility of a rival wife of a rival wife, and consequently these cases were omitted from the mishna’s list of fifteen women.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.3b.5?lang=bi&sbsq=aylonit%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 3b:5)

(78, 79, 80, 81, 82, 83, 84) “Rather, Abaye rejects the previous suggestion that one verse teaches about the other, and said: The claim that the verse “Then shall she go out for nothing” is referring to adulthood is necessary only for the adulthood of a **sexually underdeveloped woman** who is incapable of bearing children **[ailonit].** An **ailonit** will never develop the physical signs of maturity, i.e., two pubic hairs. Consequently, she does not go through the halakhic stage of a young woman. Instead, she remains a minor until the age of twenty, at which point she immediately becomes an adult. Consequently, if the Torah did not teach that a Hebrew maidservant leaves her master upon becoming an adult, it might enter your mind to say: She leaves only when entering her youth, but when entering adulthood directly she does not leave. Since an **ailonit** is never classified as a young woman, she would never leave servitude. Therefore, the verse teaches us that a Hebrew maidservant leaves her master even if she reaches adulthood directly. Mar bar Rav Ashi objects to this: But is it not an a fortiori inference? And if the signs indicating that a young woman has entered puberty do not fully release a young woman from her father’s authority, as he can still betroth her, nevertheless, they do release her from the master’s authority; is it not logical that adulthood, which completely releases her from her father’s authority, should release her from the master’s authority? If so, one can derive by this reasoning that an **ailonit** leaves her master in adulthood, which means the verse is unnecessary. Rather, Mar bar Rav Ashi says: This verse is necessary only with regard to the basic halakha of the sale of an **ailonit** as a Hebrew maidservant. As it might enter your mind to say that if a female will show the signs of a young woman, i.e., puberty, her sale is a valid sale, whereas in a case where she will not show the signs of a young woman, her sale is not a valid sale. The reason one might think this is the case is that if the maidservant turns out to be an **ailonit**, one cannot fulfill the requirements of the verse, as she will never become a young woman. Therefore the superfluous phrase: “Then shall she go out for nothing, without money” (Exodus 21:11), teaches us that even an **ailonit** can be sold as a Hebrew maidservant and is released upon reaching adulthood.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Kiddushin.4a.18?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Kiddushin 4a:18-4b:1)

(85) “The Sages then clarified this halakha: And if, before the husband had died, any of those forbidden women had died, or had performed refusal; or had been divorced; or had been found to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman [ailonit]**, who is incapable of bearing children, then her rival wives are permitted to the yavam.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Kiddushin.44b.11?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Kiddushin 44b:11)

(86, 87) “Rabbi Meir said to them: In the case of a male minor I am concerned lest he is found to be a **eunuch**, i.e., one who is incapable of fathering children, when he grows up. Similarly, a female minor may not enter into levirate marriage lest when she grows up she is found to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman [ailonit],** who is incapable of bearing children. In either case the mitzva of levirate marriage does not apply, and they would be found to have encountered a forbidden relative and entered into a forbidden relationship where no mitzva applies, as the entire purpose of levirate marriage is to have children for the brother who died childless. And the Rabbis hold: Follow the majority of male minors, and most male minors are not **eunuchs**; and likewise, follow the majority of female minors, and most female minors are not **sexually underdeveloped women**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.19b.11?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 19b:11-12)

(88, 89, 90, 91) “Rabbi Meir said to them: A minor boy may not enter into levirate marriage lest, once he is older, he be found to be a **sexually underdeveloped man**, who is incapable of fathering children. Likewise, a minor girl may not enter into levirate marriage lest, once she is older, she be found to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman**. And if a **sexually underdeveloped boy or girl** enters into levirate marriage they will be found to be infringing upon prohibitions against forbidden sexual intercourse where no mitzva applies, as the entire purpose of levirate marriage is to bear children in the name of the deceased. The Gemara notes: And the Rabbis maintain that one follows the majority of minor boys, and most minor boys are not going to be **sexually underdeveloped men**; likewise, one follows the majority of minor girls, and most minor girls are not going to be **sexually underdeveloped women**. In any event, the baraita indicates that Rabbi Meir is concerned for the minority. The Gemara objects: You can say that you heard that Rabbi Meir is concerned for a common minority, e.g., the minority of **sexually underdeveloped men and sexually underdeveloped women.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.32a.3?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 32a:3-5)

(92, 93, 94, 95) “MISHNA: A girl twelve years and one day old who grew two pubic hairs is classified as a young woman. Six months later, she becomes a grown woman. But a woman who is twenty years old who did not grow two pubic hairs and was never classified as a young woman

shall bring proof that she is twenty years old, and from that point forward she assumes the status of a sexually **underdeveloped woman [ailonit],** who is incapable of bearing children. If she married and her husband died childless, she neither performs ḥalitza nor does she enter into levirate marriage, as the mitzva of levirate marriage applies only to a woman capable of conceiving a child. An **ailonit** is excluded from that mitzva. In the case of a man who is twenty years old who did not grow two pubic hairs, they shall bring proof that he is twenty years old and he assumes the status of a **sexually underdeveloped man [saris],** who is excluded from the mitzva of levirate marriage. Therefore, if his married brother dies childless, he neither performs ḥalitza nor enters into levirate marriage with his yevama. This is the statement of Beit Hillel. Beit Shammai say: For both this case of a woman and that case of a man, they shall bring proof that they are eighteen years old, and they assume the status of a **sexually underdeveloped woman and man** respectively. Rabbi Eliezer says: The status of the male is determined in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel, i.e., he assumes the status of a **sexually underdeveloped man** at the age of twenty; and the status of the female is determined in accordance with the statement of Beit Shammai, i.e., she assumes the status of a **sexually underdeveloped woman** at the age of eighteen. The reason is that the woman is quick to reach physical maturity, and reaches that stage before the man reaches physical maturity.
GEMARA: The mishna teaches that a **sexually underdeveloped man** does not enter into levirate marriage with the widow of his childless brother. And the Gemara raises a contradiction from another mishna (Yevamot 96b): A boy who is nine years and one day old, who has not developed two hairs, and a man who is twenty years old who has not grown two hairs, are one and the same to me with regard to levirate marriage, in that if they engaged in intercourse with the widow of their childless brother, this levirate marriage is partially effective, to the extent that this woman requires both a bill of divorce and ḥalitza. Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak says that Rav says in explanation of the ruling of the mishna here: And this halakha applies only in a case where he developed physical signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man** (see Yevamot 80b) by the age of twenty. By contrast, the mishna in Yevamot is referring to one who did not develop signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man**. Rava said: The language of the mishna is also precise, as it teaches: And he is a **sexually underdeveloped man,** which indicates that he had already developed physical signs of such a condition. The Gemara concludes: Conclude from it that this is the correct interpretation of the mishna. The Gemara asks a question with regard to the halakha itself: And in a case where he does not develop the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man**, until what age is he considered a minor? Rabbi Ḥiyya teaches: Until most of his years have passed, i.e., until he reaches the age of thirty-five, halfway to seventy, which is the standard length of a person’s life. The Gemara relates: When people would come before Rabbi Ḥiyya to inquire about someone who had reached the age of puberty but had not yet developed the physical signs of maturity, if the person in question was thin, he would say to them: Go and fatten him up before we decide on his status. If he was fat, Rabbi Ḥiyya would say to them: Go and make him thin. As these signs indicating puberty sometimes come due to thinness and sometimes they come due to fatness. It is therefore possible that after his bodily shape is properly adjusted this individual will develop the signs indicating puberty and will not have the status of a **sexually underdeveloped man**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.47b.9?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 47b:9-15)

(96, 97, 98, 99) “And furthermore, it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer with regard to the halakhot of a **sexually underdeveloped man and a sexually underdeveloped woman:** The twentieth year, of which thirty days have passed, i.e., from the age of nineteen and thirty days, is considered like the twentieth year in all regards; and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi similarly issued a practical ruling of halakha in the city of Lod, that the eighteenth year of which thirty days have passed is considered like the eighteenth year in all regards. Granted, according to the opinion of Ulla, it is not difficult that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is referring to the eighteenth year whereas Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar discusses the twentieth year, as this statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai with regard to the age of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, and that statement of Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. But according to the opinion of Rav, who maintains that full years are required for a **sexually underdeveloped man or woman**, this baraita poses a difficulty. The Gemara answers that this matter is a dispute between tanna’im, and Rav maintains in accordance with the opinion that full years are required. As it is taught in a baraita: Full years are required with regard to the period of one year stated with regard to sacrificial animals, e.g., “a lamb in its first year” (Leviticus 12:6); the one year stated with regard to houses of walled cities, during which one can redeem a house he has sold in a walled city (see Leviticus 25:29); and the two years stated with regard to an ancestral field, during which one cannot yet redeem an ancestral field he has sold (see Leviticus 25:15). The six years stated with regard to a Hebrew slave (see Exodus 21:2) and similarly the years of a son and of a daughter, as will be explained, all of these are years from the time of the first year until that same time of year in the year specified, i.e., these periods are units of whole years instead of expiring on predetermined dates, as at the end of the calendar year. This supports the opinion of Rav that the years mentioned with regard to a **sexually underdeveloped man or woman** are full years.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.47b.18?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 47b:18-21)

(100) “A **sexually underdeveloped woman** who is incapable of bearing children **[ailonit],** and an elderly woman, and a woman who is incapable of giving birth for other reasons, neither collect payment of their marriage contracts nor drink the bitter water, as marrying a woman who cannot give birth constitutes a violation of the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply. Rabbi Elazar says: He can marry another woman and procreate through her; therefore, these are considered permitted marriages, and women in these categories can drink the bitter water. And all other women either drink the bitter water or do not collect payment of their marriage contracts. The wife of a priest drinks, and if she is found to be innocent of adultery, she is permitted to her husband. The wife of a **eunuch** also drinks.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.24a.6?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 24a:6-7)

(101, 102) “The mishna states (24a): A woman who was pregnant with the child of another man at the time of her marriage…A **sexually underdeveloped woman**, who is incapable of bearing children **[ailonit],** and an elderly woman, and a woman who is incapable of giving birth for other reasons, neither collect payment of their marriage contracts nor drink the bitter water. Rabbi Elazar says: He can marry another woman and procreate through her; therefore these are considered permitted marriages, and the women can drink the bitter water. Rav Naḥman says that Rabba bar Avuh says: The dispute between the first tanna and Rabbi Elazar is only in the case of a **barren woman** and an elderly woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.25b.2?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 25b:2)

(103, 104) “Say that perhaps it will turn out that she is a **sexually underdeveloped woman [ailonit]** who is incapable of bearing children, and her husband did not betroth her with this understanding; and consequently the marriage is null, as it was entered into in error. Therefore, a man who engaged in intercourse with her should not be liable to receive the death penalty for adultery. Rather, is it not that we say that one follows the majority, and the majority of women are not **sexually underdeveloped women**, and therefore the assumption is that the betrothal was valid?”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.69b.1?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 69b:1)

(105) “The Gemara refutes this claim: Rather, what are we dealing with here? With a case where the husband explicitly accepted her upon himself as his wife even if she turns out to be a **sexually undeveloped woman.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.69b.4?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20undeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 69b:4)

(106, 107, 108) “The Gemara relates an additional example of Berurya’s incisive insight: A certain heretic said to Berurya: It is written: “Sing, **barren woman** who has not given birth, open forth in song and cry, you did not travail, for more are the children of the desolate than the children of the married wife, said the Lord” (Isaiah 54:1). Because she has not given birth, she should sing and rejoice? Berurya responded to this heretic’s mockery and said: Fool! Go to the end of the verse, where it is written: “For the children of the desolate shall be more numerous than the children of the married wife, said the Lord.” Rather, what is the meaning of: “Sing, **barren woman** who has not given birth”? It means: Sing congregation of Israel, which is like a **barren woman** who did not give birth to children who are destined for Gehenna like you.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Berakhot.10a.5?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Berakhot 10a:5-7)

(109) “Rabbi Akiva said to him: If so, all **barren women** will go and seclude themselves with men who are not their husbands, and any woman who did not commit the sin of adultery will be remembered by God and granted children.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Berakhot.31b.12?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Berakhot 31b:12)

(110) “The Gemara answers: In his opinion, this remedy may be used for an elderly woman or, alternatively, for a **barren woman**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.111a.2?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 111a:2)

(111) “Rabbi Asi answered: Yes, and so it was taught in the following baraita: If a woman was eager to go to her father’s house and did not remain with her husband during his final days, or if she was angry with her husband and they separated, or if her husband was elderly or sick and could not father children, or if she was sick, or barren, or an elderly woman, or a minor, or a **sexually underdeveloped woman** who is incapable of bearing children, or a woman who was unfit to give birth for any other reason, or if her husband was imprisoned in jail, or if she had miscarried after the death of her husband, so that there is no longer any concern that she might be pregnant from him, all these women must wait three months before remarrying or even becoming betrothed; this is the statement of Rabbi Meir, who maintains that this decree applies to all women, even when the particular situation renders it unnecessary.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Eruvin.47a.18?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Eruvin 47a:18)

(112) “Since one does not complete hallel at this point in the seder, the mishna asks: Until where does one recite hallel? Beit Shammai say: Until “Who makes the **barren woman** dwell in her house as a joyful mother of children, halleluya” (Psalms 113:9).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Pesachim.116b.5?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Pesachim 116b:5)

(113) “Rabbi Shimon ben Lakish said: What is the meaning of that which is written: ‘Who makes the **barren woman** dwell in her house as a joyful mother of children, halleluya’ (Psalms 113:9)?”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Pesachim.118b.8?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Pesachim 118b:8)

(114, 115) “If a woman frequently went to her father’s house and had been there for a long time; or she had been angry with her husband and separated from him while still in his house; or her husband had been incarcerated in prison; or her husband had gone overseas; or her husband had been old or ill; or if she was a **barren woman**, or elderly, or a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, or a minor girl; or if she had miscarried after the death of her husband; or if she was unfit to give birth for any other reason, although in any of these cases there is no concern that she might be pregnant, they must all wait at least three months.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Ketubot.60b.8?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Ketubot 60b:8)

(116, 117) “The mishna states (24a): A woman who was pregnant with the child of another man at the time of her marriage…A **sexually underdeveloped woman**, who is incapable of bearing children **[ailonit]**, and an elderly woman, and a woman who is incapable of giving birth for other reasons, neither collect payment of their marriage contracts nor drink the bitter water. Rabbi Elazar says: He can marry another woman and procreate through her; therefore these are considered permitted marriages, and the women can drink the bitter water. Rav Naḥman says that Rabba bar Avuh says: The dispute between the first tanna and Rabbi Elazar is only in the case of a **barren woman** and an elderly woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.25b.2?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 25b:2)

(118, 119, 120) “The baraita continues: In the case of a young man who married a **barren woman** or an elderly woman, and he did not have a wife and children beforehand, the woman neither drinks nor collects payment of her marriage contract, as it is prohibited for him to marry a woman with whom he cannot procreate. Rabbi Elazar says: This marriage is not forbidden, as he can marry another woman and procreate through her, and therefore she can drink the bitter water. The baraita continues: However, in the case of one who issued a warning to his betrothed, or to his yevama while she was a widow awaiting her yavam, and she secluded herself with the other man after he consummated the marriage, she either drinks the bitter water or does not collect payment of her marriage contract. If his own pregnant or nursing wife becomes a sota, then despite the concern that the bitter water may harm the fetus, she either drinks the bitter water or does not collect payment of her marriage contract. In the case of a young man who married a **barren woman** or an elderly woman, and he already had a wife and children and was therefore permitted to marry his **barren or elderly wife**, the woman either drinks the bitter water or does not collect payment of her marriage contract.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.26a.3?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 26a:3-4)

(121, 122, 123) “Since they hold that a **sexually underdeveloped woman** drinks the bitter water, what do they derive from the verse? The Gemara answers: They require it for that which is taught in a baraita: The verse: “And she shall be cleared, and shall conceive seed” (Numbers 5:28), indicates that if she was barren, she will be remembered and conceive a child; this is the statement of Rabbi Akiva. Rabbi Yishmael said to him: If so, all the **barren women** will seclude themselves with other men, and they will be remembered and conceive after drinking the bitter water and being found innocent; but that virtuous **barren woman**, who does not transgress the prohibition of seclusion, since she does not seclude herself with other men, she loses the opportunity to receive this blessing.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.26a.7?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 26a:7)

(124, 125, 126, 127, 128) “MISHNA: With regard to one who divorces his wife because she is a **sexually underdeveloped woman** who is incapable of bearing children **[ailonit]**, meaning that after their marriage it became clear that **she was sexually underdeveloped**, Rabbi Yehuda says: He may not remarry her, and the Rabbis say: He may remarry her. If, after he divorced her, this **ailonit** married another man and had children from him, meaning that she was not actually an **ailonit**, and she is demanding payment of her marriage contract from her first husband, claiming that he unlawfully divorced her without paying her marriage contract as he claimed that she was an **ailonit** and their marriage was a mistaken transaction, Rabbi Yehuda said that he may say to her: Your silence is preferable to your speech, meaning that it is preferable for her to withdraw her claim. If she persists, he may say that he divorced her only because he believed her to be an **ailonit**, casting aspersions on the validity of the divorce and the status of her children.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Gittin.46b.5?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Gittin 46b:5-6)

(129) “The Gemara challenges: But from the fact that it teaches in the last clause of the mishna: If, after he divorced her, this **ailonit** married another man and had children from him, and she is demanding payment of her marriage contract from her first husband, Rabbi Yehuda said that he may say to her: Your silence is preferable to your speech, and one can learn by inference that Rabbi Yehuda is concerned about potential harm.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Gittin.46b.10?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Gittin 46b:10)

(130, 131) “We are dealing with a situation where he did not compound his condition, as he stated only that he is divorcing her because she is an **ailonit**, but did not state that he would not divorce her if she were not an **ailonit**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Gittin.46b.13?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Gittin 46b:13)

(132, 133) “The mishna discusses another case: These rival wives went and married another man without ḥalitza, and these widows with whom relationships were forbidden were found to be **sexually underdeveloped women** incapable of bearing children **[ailonit]**. Therefore, it became clear, retroactively, that the marriage to the dead brother was never valid, and accordingly, the rival wives were never exempt from the obligation of levirate marriage due to their being the rival wives of a forbidden relationship. Consequently, the rival wives were forbidden to marry anyone else without ḥalitza, and the rival wives must leave both this man whom they remarried, and that yavam, i.e., they cannot enter into levirate marriage with him. And all of those above-mentioned ways of penalizing a woman who remarried based on the bills of divorce detailed in the earlier clause of the mishna apply to her in this case as well. Similarly, with regard to one who marries his yevama, and her rival wife went and got married to another man, and it was found that this yevama was a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, the rival wife must leave this man whom she remarried and that yavam, i.e., she cannot enter into levirate marriage with him. Because the yevama was a sexually underdeveloped woman, the obligation of levirate marriage never applied to her, and her levirate marriage did not exempt her rival wife.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Gittin.80a.5?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Gittin 80a:5-6)

(134) “It was taught in the mishna that in all of those cases in which they said that a man who died and left behind a widow who is to the yavam one of those with whom relations are forbidden, and the rival wives were thought to be permitted to remarry, if it later became clear that the forbidden relation was an **ailonit** and therefore they were in fact forbidden from remarrying, then they must leave the man whom they remarried, and they cannot enter into levirate marriage with the yavam, and many other penalties apply to them as well.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Gittin.80b.8?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Gittin 80b:8)

(135) “It was taught in the mishna that one who marries his yevama, and her rival wife went and married another man, and ultimately the yevama was found to be an **ailonit**, then the rival wife must leave her husband, and she cannot enter into levirate marriage with the yavam, and many other penalties apply to her as well.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Gittin.80b.14?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Gittin 80b:14)

(136) “And if the mishna had taught us this halakha here, with regard to a yavam who married a yevama who was ultimately found to be an **ailonit**, then one could say that specifically here there is reason to penalize her, because this rival wife who remarried was also placed before the yavam, as he could have entered into levirate marriage with any of his brother’s wives.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Gittin.80b.16?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Gittin 80b:16)

(137, 138, 139, 140, 141, 142) “I was sitting before Rav Naḥman when he said that mistaken forgiveness is valid, and I wanted to raise an objection to him from the halakha of exploitation, and he observed me, anticipated my objection, and showed me that he was correct based on the halakha of a **sexually underdeveloped woman** who is incapable of bearing children **[ailonit]**. The Gemara explains: Rava wanted to ask: But there is the case of exploitation, where the price paid in a sale was in excess of the market value (see 50b), which is a case of mistaken forgiveness at the time of the sale, and yet it is not considered forgiveness. The seller must return the excess money paid. And he observed me and showed me the halakha of an ailonit. Doesn’t the case of an **ailonit** involve mistaken forgiveness, and yet it is valid forgiveness? Rava explains: As we learned in a mishna (Ketubot 100b): In the case of a minor girl married off by her mother or brother who refuses to continue living with her husband, and in the case of a woman who is a secondary forbidden relative, and in the case of an **ailonit**, each of these women is not entitled to payment of a marriage contract, and they are not entitled to remuneration for the produce that the husband consumed from her property while they were together, and they are not entitled to sustenance, and they are not entitled to their worn clothes that were brought into the marriage as part of their dowry and became worn out during the marriage. The **ailonit** granted the rights to the profits the husband earned from her property while under the mistaken premise that she was married. Yet after the marriage was determined to have been contracted in error, the husband does not have to return these profits. The Gemara comments: But that is not so; the halakha of exploitation is not a refutation of Rav Naḥman’s opinion, nor does the case of a **sexually underdeveloped woman** support his opinion, as there are differences between the cases. The Gemara clarifies: Exploitation is not a refutation of his opinion, as the buyer does not know that there is exploitation at the time of the sale that would enable him to forgive him the amount he was overcharged, and therefore there is no forgiveness in this case at all. Nor does the case of a **sexually underdeveloped woman** support his opinion, as it is amenable to her for her husband to receive the profits in order that she receive the name of a married woman.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Metzia.67a.1?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Metzia 67a:1-4)

(143, 144) “One says: This is an abbreviation for the phrase: To unlock the mouth [lehattir peh] that is above, i.e., the leaf heals the mute. And one says: That is the abbreviation, but it means to unlock the mouth that is below, a euphemism for healing the womb of a **barren woman**. It was also stated that other Sages engaged in a dispute concerning this matter. Ḥizkiyya says that the reference is: To unlock the mouth of mutes, and bar Kappara says that the reference is: To unlock the mouth of **barren women**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sanhedrin.100a.11?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sanhedrin 100a:11-12)

(145, 146) “And one said the leaf shall serve to unlock the mouth that is below, i.e., the womb, enabling **barren women** to give birth. It was likewise stated that Ḥizkiyya says: The leaf shall serve to unlock the mouth of the mute, whereas bar Kappara says: It shall serve to unlock the mouth, i.e., the womb, of the **barren women**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Menachot.98a.14?lang=bi&sbsq=barren&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Menachot 98a:14)

(147) “Should a woman be less than thirty days below the age of twenty, not have grown two pubic hairs, and have manifested [all] the physical signs of barrenness, she is deemed an **aylonit (a barren woman).**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Marriage.2.4?lang=en: Mishneh Torah, Marriage 2:4)

147 total mentions

Saris

Note: Depending on the version you are reading it can either say Saris or Eunuch, in Sefaria it says Eunuch, so I included every mention of Eunuch. It also uses terms like “man of crushed testicles” and “sexually underdeveloped man” so those will also be included.

(1, 2, 3) “R. Huna, however, maintained in the name of R. Yosé: Though we have been taught that the husband of a pregnant woman who prays “May it be Thy will that my wife bear a son” is uttering a vain prayer, this is not so. In fact, **he may pray for the birth of a son even as she commences labor, for it is not difficult for the Holy One, blessed be He, to convert females into males and males into females.** He quoted a verse from Jeremiah to support this statement: Then I went down to the potter’s house, and behold, he was at his work on the wheels. And whensoever the vessel he made of the clay was marred in the hand of the potter, he made it again another vessel, as it seemed good to the potter to make it (Jer. 18:3–4). And did not the Holy One, blessed be He, say to Jeremiah: O house of Israel, cannot I do with you as this potter? (ibid., v. 6).
You find that this happened to Leah. After she had given birth to six sons, she foresaw in a dream that Jacob would ultimately have twelve sons. Since she had already given birth to six sons, and was pregnant with her seventh child, and the two handmaidens had each borne two sons, making ten sons in all, Leah arose and pleaded with the Holy One, saying: Master of the Universe, twelve tribes are to descend from Jacob, and since I have already given birth to six sons, and am pregnant with a seventh child, and each of the handmaidens has born two sons, which accounts for ten sons, if the child within me is a male, my sister will not bear even as many sons as the handmaidens. **The Holy One, blessed be He, hearkened to her prayer and converted the fetus in her womb into a female**, as it is said: And afterwards she bore a daughter and called her Dinah (Gen. 30:21). The masculine form of afterwards is written in this verse, and not the feminine form **(thus signifying that the fetus was originally that of a male child).**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Midrash_Tanchuma%2C_Vayetzei.8.2?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Midrash Tanchuma, Vayetzei 8:2-3)

(4, 5) “I have already revealed to you last Shabbat concerning your first two wives. Now I have come to reveal to you the secret of your third wife. You should know that this woman was in the past, a proper Torah scholar. However, he was stingy with his money and would not give charity. He was also stingy with his wisdom and would not teach others. **He was therefore punished that his soul migrated into a woman, measure for measure. Therefore, his soul was incarnated into a female**, who is constantly receiving and needs someone to bequeath to her. Therefore you see, that she does abundant charity and loves you very much because you work to spread Torah and toil in writing books to teach others…because these things bring about the rectification of her soul, she therefore loves you… **It is because she has the soul of a male** that you have not had children from her, because a male and another male cannot produce offspring. If you shall point out that she has children from her first husband, this is because **the first husband has the spark of a female soul within him…**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Maggid_Meisharim.8.3?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Maggid Meisharim 8:3)

(6) “These are the signs of impotency: a) One lacks a beard, b) his hair grows inadequately, c) his flesh is hairless, d) his urine does not produce vapor, e) his urine does not flow in an arc, f) his semen is off color, g) his urine does not ferment, h) when he washes in the winter, his flesh does not produce steam, and i) his voice is high pitched and cannot be differentiated from that of a woman. An impotent person of this type is referred to as a s'ris chamah [one who became impotent because of fever]. When, however, the genitals of a male have been cut, severed or crushed, as the gentiles do, the person is called a **s'ris adam** [one who became impotent as a result of human activity]. When such a person reaches the age of thirteen and one day, he is considered to be an adult, for he will never manifest signs of maturity.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishneh_Torah%2C_Marriage.2.14?lang=en: Mishneh Torah, Marriage 2:13-14)

(7) “Likewise, the wife of a **seris chammah (one born without testicles), and a hermaphrodite** is subject to neither chalitzah not yibum, it being written (Ibid. 5): "and he have no son" — to exclude those who are incapable of begetting children.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Yevamot.2.3?ven=english|The_Mishna_with_Obadiah_Bartenura_by_Rabbi_Shraga_Silverstein&lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Yevamot 2:3)

(https://archive.ph/CNDvg#selection-469.78-469.317:~:text=Likewise%2C%20the%20wife%20of%20a%20seris%20chammah%20(one%20born%20without%20testicles)%2C%20and%20a%20hermaphrodite%20is%20subject%20to%20neither%20chalitzah%20not%20yibum%2C%20it%20being%20written%20(Ibid.%205)%3A%20%22and%20he%20have%20no%20son%22%20%E2%80%94%20to%20exclude%20those%20who%20are%20incapable%20of%20begetting%20children)

(8, 9, 10) “It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yehuda says: If a ***tumtum***, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform *ḥalitza* because he is treated like a **eunuch**. Rabbi Ami said: What would Rabbi Yehuda do with the ***tumtum*** living in the town of Biri, who was placed in a seat for an operation, and the tissue covering his genitals was torn open and he later fathered seven children? Evidently, a ***tumtum*** who was torn open is not necessarily sexually impotent. The Gemara answers that Rabbi Yehuda could have said to you: Go and inquire about his children and find out from where they came. He did not believe that they were fathered by this man but rather by someone else. It is taught in a *baraita*: Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: A ***tumtum*** must not perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a **eunuch by natural causes**. The Gemara asks: Why did he formulate his teaching in this manner? Is that to say that every ***tumtum*** who is torn open is a male? It is certainly possible for a ***tumtum*** to be found to be a female. The Gemara explains: This is what he said: A ***tumtum*** must not perform *ḥalitza*, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a female, who certainly cannot perform *ḥalitza*, and even if he is found to be a male, perhaps he will be found to be a **eunuch by natural causes**. The Gemara asks: What is the practical halakhic difference between the opinions of Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei? Rava said: There is a practical difference between them as to whether the *ḥalitza* performed by a ***tumtum*** disqualifies the brothers in a case where there are other brothers in addition to the ***tumtum***. According to Rabbi Yehuda, a ***tumtum*** is regarded as definitely sexually impotent, and therefore his *ḥalitza* is of no consequence. Therefore, if the ***tumtum*** went ahead and performed *ḥalitza*, he has not disqualified the other brothers from performing levirate marriage. According to Rabbi Yosei, however, he is only doubtfully sexually impotent, and therefore he has disqualified the other brothers from performing levirate marriage. And there is also a difference between them as to whether the ***tumtum*** must perform *ḥalitza* where there are no other brothers besides him.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.83b.6?lang=en&sbsq=tumtum&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 83b:6-8)

(11, 12) “If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: **If a priest who is a hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yehuda says: **If a tumtum, whose** external **sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch**. A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman but he may not be married by a man, as he is considered a man. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had had relations with a male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Yevamot.8.6?lang=en: Mishnah, Yevamot 8:6)

(13, 14) “MISHNA: If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*. Rabbi Yehuda says: If a ***tumtum*, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform *ḥalitza*, because he is treated like a **eunuch**. A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman but he may not be married by a man, as he is considered a man. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had had relations with a male. GEMARA: The Gemara questions the mishna’s teaching concerning a priest who was sexually impotent from birth: This is obvious; why should such a priest not enable his wife to partake of *teruma*? The Gemara answers: This *halakha* is necessary lest you say that since the verse states: “And such as are born in his house, they eat of his bread” (Leviticus 22:11), the allowance to eat *teruma* depends on the priest’s capacity to father children, i.e., that only one who can father children enables his wife to eat *teruma*, but one who cannot father children does not enable his wife to eat *teruma*. Therefore, the *tanna* teaches us that the priest’s capacity to have children is irrelevant. It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat *teruma*.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.81a.3?lang=en&sbsq=hermaphrodite%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 81a:3-6)

(15, 16) “If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: **If a priest who is a hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yehuda says: **If a tumtum, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch**. A **hermaphrodite** may marry a woman but he may not be married by a man, as he is considered a man. Rabbi Eliezer says: If one had intercourse with a **hermaphrodite**, he is liable to receive the punishment of stoning on his account as if he had had relations with a male.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Yevamot.8.6?lang=en: Mishnah, Yevamot 8:6)

(17, 18) “Rava raised an objection from that which was taught in the *Tosefta* (*Yevamot* 11:3): A **man with crushed testicles** or with other wounds to his genitals or one whose penis has been severed, one who is a **eunuch** caused by man and not from birth or by disease, or an elderly man, all of whom are incapable of fathering children, one either performs *ḥalitza* or levirate marriage.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.20b.4?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 20b:4)

(19) “This excludes the case where the deceased was a **eunuch**, as his name is already blotted out, since it is impossible for him to have children.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.24a.7?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 24a:7)

(20) “Rabbi Meir said to them: A boy minor may not perform levirate marriage lest he be found to be a **eunuch,** i.e., one who is incapable of fathering children for his late brother. Similarly, a girl minor may not perform levirate marriage lest **she be found to be sexually underdeveloped** when she grows up.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.61b.6?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 61b:6)

(21) “If one of a man’s children died or was discovered to be a **eunuch**, the father has not fulfilled the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.62b.2?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 62b:2)

(22, 23, 24) “Rabbi Yishmael, son of Rabbi Yoḥanan ben Beroka, said: I heard from the Sages in the vineyard in Yavne that anyone who has only one testicle is nothing other than a **eunuch by natural causes**, and he is fit. The Gemara is puzzled by the wording of this last teaching: Can it enter your mind that he is a **eunuch by natural causes**, i.e., from birth? That designation refers to one who was born without testicles, whereas the reference here is to one who lost a testicle as the result of an injury. Rather, say that he resembles a **eunuch by natural causes**, and he is fit.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.75a.17?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 75a:17-18)

(25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50) “One ruling is that a **eunuch** performs ḥalitza with his yevama, and his brothers perform ḥalitza with his wife, and the other ruling is that a **eunuch** does not perform ḥalitza with his yevama, and his brothers do not perform ḥalitza with his wife. And I cannot explain these two rulings, as I do not remember the circumstances to which each ruling applies. Rabbi Akiva said: I will explain. A **eunuch** caused by man, i.e., one who **became emasculated after birth**, performs ḥalitza with his yevama and his brothers perform ḥalitza with his wife, because he had an hour of fitness, a time when he was fertile. On the other hand, a **eunuch by natural causes**, i.e., who was entirely lacking in sexual capacity from birth, does not perform ḥalitza with his yevama and his brothers do not perform ḥalitza with his wife, because he did not have an hour of fitness, as he never had the potential to father children. Rabbi Eliezer says: No; rather, the opposite is the case: A **eunuch by natural causes** performs ḥalitza with his yevama and his brothers perform ḥalitza with his wife because he can be cured, whereas a eunuch caused by man does not perform ḥalitza with his

yevama and his brothers do not perform ḥalitza with his wife because he cannot be cured. Rabbi Yehoshua ben Beteira testified about a man named ben Megusat, who lived in Jerusalem and was a **eunuch** caused by man, that his brothers nevertheless entered into levirate marriage with his wife, in order to fulfill and confirm the statement of Rabbi Akiva. A **sexually underdeveloped man** does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with his yevama. And similarly, a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]**, who is incapable of bearing children, does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with her yavam. If a **sexually underdeveloped man** performed ḥalitza with his yevama, he has not thereby disqualified her from marrying into the priesthood, as his ḥalitza is invalid. However, if he had intercourse with her, he has disqualified her. This is because it is considered licentious sexual intercourse, since such intercourse does not fulfill the mitzva of levirate marriage and is therefore categorized as forbidden relations with one's sister-in-law. And similarly, with regard to a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, if one of the brothers performed ḥalitza with her he has not thereby disqualified her from marrying into the priesthood. However, if he had intercourse with her, he has disqualified her because the intercourse is considered licentious sexual intercourse. GEMARA: Now, we learned that Rabbi Akiva said: Those liable for violating a prohibition are like those liable to receive karet with regard to the validity of their marriage and all its ramifications, and those liable to receive karet are not eligible to perform ḥalitza or levirate marriage. A **eunuch** caused by man has the status of a **man with crushed testicles**, and is therefore prohibited by a standard negative mitzva from marrying a Jewish woman. If he violated the prohibition and married her, his marriage is invalid according to Rabbi Akiva, just as if he had married a woman who is forbidden to him by a prohibition punishable by karet. Why, then, should his ḥalitza be valid? Rabbi Ami said: With what are we dealing here? We are dealing with a case where the **eunuch's** brother had married a convert, and Rabbi Akiva holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, who said that the congregation of converts is not called a congregation of the Lord. Consequently, it is permitted even for those for whom it is prohibited to enter into the congregation, e.g., a eunuch, to marry converts. The Gemara raises a difficulty: If so, the eunuch should also be able to perform levirate marriage with the convert. The Gemara answers: Yes, it is indeed so, but since Rabbi Yehoshua said that a **eunuch** performs ḥalitza with his yevama, Rabbi Akiva as well said that he performs ḥalitza with her, while in fact he may enter into levirate marriage with her if he so chooses. The Gemara adds: The language of the mishna is also precise in this regard, as it teaches: Rabbi Yehoshua ben Beteira testified about a man named ben Megusat, who lived in Jerusalem and was a **eunuch** caused by man, that his brothers entered into levirate marriage with his wife, to fulfill the statement of Rabbi Akiva. This indicates that according to Rabbi Akiva, not only ḥalitza but even levirate marriage is permitted. The Gemara concludes: Learn from this that this is the correct understanding of the mishna. Rabba raised an objection from the following baraita: A **man with crushed testicles**, and one whose **penis has been severed**, and a **eunuch** caused by man, and an elderly man who is no longer capable of fathering children, may either perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage. The baraita clarifies the matter: How so? If these men died and they had wives and they also had brothers, and the brothers proceeded to perform levirate betrothal with their wives, or gave them a bill of divorce, or performed ḥalitza with them, what they did is done, i.e., it is a valid act. And if the brothers had intercourse with the wives, they acquired them in levirate marriage, like any other yevama. If the brothers of these sexually impaired men died, and the sexually impaired men proceeded to perform levirate betrothal with their brothers' wives, or gave them a bill of divorce, or performed ḥalitza with them, what they did

is done, i.e., it is a valid act. And if they had intercourse with their brothers' wives they acquired them in levirate marriage, but they are prohibited from maintaining them as their wives because it is stated: "A **man with crushed testicles** or a severed penis shall not enter into the congregation of the Lord" (Deuteronomy 23:2). Apparently, we are dealing with a case where the **eunuch's** brother had married a woman who is in the congregation of the Lord, i.e., a Jew from birth who is governed by this prohibition, and not a convert. Rather, Rabba said that the case here is one where one's brother died and his yevama happened before him for levirate marriage, and he was injured only afterward. Since the mitzva of levirate marriage had initially applied to him, he performs ḥalitza with her. Abaye said to him: If so, let the prohibition applying to a **man with crushed testicles** come and override the positive mitzva of levirate marriage. Didn't we learn in a mishna (109a) as follows: With regard to a case of two brothers who were married to two sisters, one of whom was a minor married off by her brothers in a marriage valid only by rabbinic decree, and the brother who was married to the adult sister passed away, Rabban Gamliel says: If the minor sister refuses her husband, declaring that she does not desire the marriage, she has refused him. Since the marriage is valid only by rabbinic decree, the girl may terminate it before she reaches the age of twelve by declaring that she does not wish to remain in the marriage, and no bill of divorce is required. In such a case the marriage is nullified retroactively, and so her former husband, the yavam, may perform levirate marriage with her sister. The mishna continues: But if she does not refuse him, the minor must wait and her husband must not have relations with her until she reaches adulthood and their marriage is valid by Torah law, since in the meantime she is forbidden to him as the sister of a woman awaiting levirate marriage with him. At that point, when the minor reaches adulthood, this one, the adult sister, goes out free from the yavam without levirate marriage or ḥalitza as his wife's sister. Apparently, the prohibition with regard to a wife's sister comes and overrides the mitzva of levirate marriage that had previously been in effect. Here too, then, let the prohibition applying to a **man with crushed testicles** come and override the positive mitzva of levirate marriage. Rather, Rav Yosef said: This tanna of our mishna is the tanna of the school of Rabbi Akiva, who said that only the child born of a union between those who are liable for violating prohibitions involving incestuous relationships is a mamzer, but the child born of a union between people who are liable for violating ordinary prohibitions is not a mamzer. The prohibition applying to a **man with crushed testicles** falls into the latter category, and therefore his marriage is valid and he may perform ḥalitza. The Gemara asks: Why does the mitzva of levirate marriage apply at all to a **eunuch**? Read here the verse with regard to levirate marriage: "To establish a name for his brother in Israel" (Deuteronomy 25:7), and this one is no longer capable of this, even if previously he had an hour of fitness when he was fertile earlier in his life. Rava said: If it is so that anyone who cannot presently father children is exempt from levirate marriage even if he had previously been capable of doing so, there is no instance of a woman who is fit for the yavam, as even if her husband died of natural causes it is impossible that he did not become like a **eunuch by natural causes** an hour before his death. He had certainly lost his fertility before dying, and therefore he has the status of a eunuch, which means that the mitzva of levirate marriage should not apply in his case at all. Rather, it must be that a man who had previously been capable of fathering children is considered fit for the purposes of levirate marriage. The Gemara comments: According to the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer in the mishna that a **eunuch** caused by man does not perform ḥalitza and his marriage is invalid even though he had an hour of fitness when he was fertile, Rava's answer, his proof from the fact that all men on their deathbeds lack sexual capacity, is undoubtedly a refutation. The Gemara answers:

Rabbi Eliezer maintains that a man who is about to die cannot be compared to a **eunuch**, as there, he can no longer father children due to the general weakness that begins to take over his body as death approaches, which prevents him from engaging in relations with a woman, but his basic ability to father children remains unimpaired. The Gemara raises a practical question: What are the circumstances of a **eunuch by natural causes?**"

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.79b.3?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 79b:3-23)

(51, 52, 53, 54, 55, 56, 57, 58, 59, 60, 61, 62, 63) "A **eunuch** is not impaired in a single organ; rather, he has a defect that affects his entire body. Consequently, there is no concern that, though he was born with the defect and presently suffers from it, he might have regained his potency for some time in the middle. It is taught in the mishna that Rabbi Eliezer says: No; rather, a **eunuch by natural causes** performs ḥalitza, whereas a **eunuch** caused by man does not perform ḥalitza. The Gemara raises a contradiction from the following mishna (Nidda 47b): If a twenty-year-old man has not grown two pubic hairs, a sign of sexual maturity, the relatives of the widow who wish to exempt her from ḥalitza and levirate marriage must bring proof that he is twenty years old, and he, having been established as a **sexually underdeveloped man**, does not perform ḥalitza or levirate marriage with his yevama. If a twenty-year-old woman has not grown two pubic hairs, the relatives of her deceased husband's brother must bring proof that she is twenty years old, and she, having been established as a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with her yavam. This is the statement of Beit Hillel. And Beit Shammai say: With regard to both this and that, males and females, the relevant age is eighteen years old, not twenty. The mishna continues: Rabbi Eliezer says that for a male the halakha is in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel, and for a female the halakha is in accordance with the statement of Beit Shammai, because a woman reaches maturity more quickly than does a man, and therefore, if she fails to develop the signs of maturity by the age of eighteen it is assumed that she is a **sexually underdeveloped woman**. In any case, it is clear from this mishna that even Rabbi Eliezer agrees that one who lacks sexual capacity from birth may neither perform ḥalitza nor enter into levirate marriage. Rami bar Dikulei said that Shmuel said: Rabbi Eliezer retracted his opinion. A dilemma was raised before the Sages: Which statement did he retract? Did he retract what he said here in the mishna, that a **eunuch by natural causes** performs ḥalitza with his yevama and his brothers perform ḥalitza with his wife? Alternatively, perhaps the mishna here reflects his final view, after he retracted what he said in the other mishna. The Gemara suggests: Come and hear a resolution to this question, as it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Eliezer says: A **eunuch by natural causes** performs ḥalitza with his yevama and his brothers perform ḥalitza with his wife, as such type of men are cured in Alexandria of Egypt. This additional source and its reasoning suggest that Rabbi Eliezer did not retract what he said in the mishna here. Rather, he retracted his statement with regard to the dispute between Beit Hillel and Beit Shammai in the other mishna. Rabbi Elazar says: Actually, he did not retract anything at all. And when we learned Rabbi Eliezer's ruling in that mishna with regard to the age of a **sexually underdeveloped individual**, that ruling was stated with regard to punishments, i.e., the age at which such an individual is considered an adult so that he is liable to receive punishment, and not with regard to ḥalitza or levirate marriage. And it was stated that the amora'im disagreed on this issue: With regard to one who ate forbidden fats or performed any other

transgression for which one is liable to receive lashes or karet, when he was between the age of twelve years and one day and the age of eighteen years, and he developed the signs of one who was a **eunuch by natural causes**, as explained below, and afterward he grew two pubic hairs, Rav said: He is retroactively considered a **eunuch by natural causes**. In other words, these hairs are not viewed as a sign of maturity. Rather, he lacked sexual capacity from the outset, which means he became an adult at the standard age of thirteen and is held liable for his actions from that point in time. And Shmuel said: No, he was a minor at the time he committed his offense, as the two hairs are a sign of his maturity, albeit delayed. Rav Yosef strongly objects to this: If so, according to Rav, a sexually underdeveloped woman according to Rabbi Meir should be entitled to the fine paid by a rapist. Rabbi Meir maintains that a rapist is liable to be fined only if he raped a young woman between the ages of twelve and twelve and a half, but not if he raped a minor. And furthermore, a sexually underdeveloped woman is not entitled to the fine because she is considered a minor, as she never showed the signs of maturity. But according to Rav she should retroactively be viewed as an adult and would therefore be entitled to the fine. Abaye said to him: A **sexually underdeveloped woman** passes directly from minority to full adulthood. In other words, she is first considered a minor and then immediately an adult, without passing through the intermediate stage of young womanhood, and an adult woman is not entitled to the rapist's fine. Greatly impressed with this answer, Rav Yosef said to Abaye: Would that all such excellent matters be stated in my name. As it is taught in a baraita: A **sexually underdeveloped man** is not judged as a stubborn and rebellious son, as a boy is judged as a stubborn and rebellious son only when he has the mark of his lower beard, i.e., when his pubic hair begins to grow in. At that point he has reached the age of maturity but is not yet a fully developed man, a stage that parallels young womanhood for women. A **sexually underdeveloped man** never passes through this intermediate stage between minority and full adulthood. And similarly, a **sexually underdeveloped woman** who was betrothed and raped is not judged in accordance with the laws governing a betrothed young woman (see Deuteronomy 22:23–27), as she passes directly from minority to full adulthood without the intermediate stage of young womanhood. Therefore, the baraita fully corroborates Abaye's view. Rabbi Abbahu said: If one has the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man**; or the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**; or the signs of a child born during the eighth month of pregnancy, whose survival is uncertain; no action is taken in their regard, i.e., the **sexually underdeveloped male or female** is not treated as an adult and the child born during the eighth month is not deemed viable, until they are twenty years old."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.80a.5?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 80a:5-14)

(64, 65, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 71, 72, 73) "The Sages taught: Who is considered a **eunuch by natural causes?** It is anyone who is twenty years old and has not yet grown two pubic hairs. And even if he grows pubic hairs afterward, he is still considered a **eunuch by natural causes** with regard to all his matters. And his signs are as follows: Whoever does not have a beard, and his hair is defective, unlike that of ordinary individuals, and his skin is smooth, i.e., hairless. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says in the name of Rabbi Yehuda ben Ya'ir: It is anyone whose urine does not raise foam. And some say: It is anyone who urinates without forming an arch. And some say: It is anyone whose semen dissipates and fails to congeal in the proper manner. And some say: Anyone whose

urine does not ferment. Others say: It is anyone who bathes in the rainy season and his flesh does not give off steam. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: It is anyone whose voice is defective, so that it is not evident from it whether he is a man or a woman. And who is a **sexually underdeveloped woman [aylonit]?** It is anyone who is twenty years old and has not yet grown two pubic hairs. And even if she grows pubic hairs afterward, she is still considered a **sexually underdeveloped woman** with regard to all her matters. And her signs are as follows: A **sexually underdeveloped woman** is anyone who does not have breasts and experiences pain during intercourse. Rabban Shimon ben Gamliel says: It is anyone whose lower abdomen is not formed like that of other women, as she lacks the cushion of flesh that is usually situated above a woman's genitals. Rabbi Shimon ben Elazar says: It is anyone whose voice is deep, so that it is not evident from it whether she is a woman or a man. It was stated that amora'im disagreed over the signs of a **eunuch**. Rav Huna said that one is not categorized as a **eunuch** unless all these signs are present; Rabbi Yoḥanan said: He is categorized as such even if only one of them is present. The Gemara comments: In a case when he has grown two hairs in his beard, everyone agrees that he is not considered sexually impotent unless all the signs are present. When they disagree, it is with regard to a case when he has not grown two hairs. The Gemara asks: But if so, with regard to that which Rabba bar Avuh said to the Sages: Examine Rav Naḥman when he bathes and if his flesh gives off steam I will give him my daughter for a wife, in accordance with whose opinion did he issue these instructions? Is it not in accordance with the opinion of Rav Huna, who maintains that all the signs must be present, as presumably he could see that Rav Naḥman did not have a beard? The Gemara answers: No, Rav Naḥman had wisps of a beard, and therefore Rabba bar Avuh wanted to know whether he displayed the other signs of sexual incapacity. It is taught in the mishna that a **sexually underdeveloped man** does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with his yevama, and similarly, a **sexually underdeveloped woman** does not perform ḥalitza or enter into levirate marriage with her yavam. The Gemara comments that the tanna teaches the case of a **sexually underdeveloped man** similarly to that of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, from which it can be inferred: Just as in the case of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, her disability is by the hand of Heaven, so too, in the case of a **sexually underdeveloped man**, his disability must be by the hand of Heaven. And this unattributed view in the mishna is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who said: With regard to one whose incapacity was brought about by the hands of man, yes, he is considered like any other man and performs ḥalitza, whereas one who suffers his condition by the hand of Heaven does not do so. It is further taught in the mishna that if a **eunuch** performed ḥalitza with his yevama, he has not thereby disqualified her from marrying into the priesthood, but if he had intercourse with her, he has disqualified her. The Gemara infers from this wording that the reason for her disqualification is that he, the yavam, had intercourse with her, as she had intercourse with her yavam outside the framework of permitted levirate marriage. But if a different individual had relations with her she would not be disqualified. Shall we say that this is a conclusive refutation of the opinion of Rav Hamnuna, who said: A widow waiting for her yavam, who engaged in an act of licentious relations, is disqualified from entering into levirate marriage with her yavam, like an ordinary married woman who committed adultery? The Gemara rejects this argument: No, this presents no difficulty for Rav Hamnuna, as it is possible that the same is true even in a case where she had relations with a different man, that she too would be disqualified from marrying into the priesthood. But since the tanna taught the first clause with regard to the yavam himself, he also taught the latter clause with regard to the yavam himself, even though the same halakha applies if she cohabitated with another.

It is taught in the mishna: And similarly, with regard to a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, if one of the brothers performed ḥalitza with her he has not disqualified her, but if he engaged in intercourse with her he has disqualified her. The Gemara infers from this wording that the reason for her disqualification is that he had intercourse with her; but if he did not have intercourse with her she is not disqualified. According to whose opinion was this clause of the mishna taught? One must say that it was not taught in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda. As, if one would claim that this teaching is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yehuda, didn't he say that a **sexually underdeveloped woman** is considered like a woman who has had sexual relations with a man forbidden to her by the Torah [zona], and so she is in any case disqualified from marrying into the priesthood? MISHNA: If a priest who is a **eunuch by natural causes** married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yosei and Rabbi Shimon say: If a priest who is a **hermaphrodite, possessing both male and female genitals**, married an Israelite woman, he enables her to eat teruma. Rabbi Yehuda says: If a **tumtum, whose external sexual organs are indeterminate**, was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.80b.4?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 80b:4-81a:4)

(74, 75, 76, 77, 78, 79) “And the Gemara raises a contradiction against this from the following source: With regard to a man twenty years old who has not developed two pubic hairs, they must bring proof that he is twenty years old, and he is established as a **eunuch**, who may neither perform ḥalitza nor perform levirate marriage. Likewise, in the case of a woman who is twenty years old and has not developed two pubic hairs, they must bring proof that she is twenty years old, and that she is a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, who may neither perform ḥalitza nor enter into levirate marriage. This shows that the status of a nine-year-old male and a twenty-year old man without pubic hairs are not the same, as the intercourse of a nine-year-old is considered of some significance, whereas that of a **eunuch** is entirely disregarded, as he may not even perform ḥalitza. The Gemara answers: Wasn’t it stated with regard to this baraita that Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak said that Rav said: And this halakha applies only if he developed other signs of a **eunuch** by the age of twenty. The mishna, by contrast, is referring to one who merely showed the signs of maturity at a late age. Rava said: The language of the baraita is also precise, as it teaches: And he is the eunuch. One can learn from here that this is referring to one who is definitely a **eunuch**. The Gemara asks a question with regard to the halakha itself: And in a case where he does not develop the signs of a **eunuch**, until what age is he considered a minor? The school of Rabbi Ḥiyya taught: Until most of his years have passed, i.e., until he reaches the age of thirty-five, i.e., halfway to seventy, the standard length of a man’s life. On the same issue, the Gemara relates: When they would come before Rava to inquire about someone who had reached the age of maturity but had not yet developed the physical signs, if the person in question was thin, he would say to them: Go and fatten him up before we decide on his status. And if he was fat, he would say to them: Go and make him thin. As these signs, the pubic hairs of maturity, sometimes they fall off due to thinness and sometimes they fall off due to fatness. It is therefore possible that after his bodily shape is adjusted he will develop the signs of maturity and will not have the status of a **eunuch**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.97a.3?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 97a:3-7)

(80) “Rabbi Meir prohibits this lest the **boy turn out to be a eunuch or the girl turn out to be sexually underdeveloped.**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.111b.13?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 111b:13)

(81, 82) “And there is also a case in which they are forbidden to these and to those, namely if they married **sexually underdeveloped women [ayloniot].** If an Egyptian married an **aylonit**, she is forbidden to him as a Jewish woman, and she is forbidden to his brother, a third-generation Egyptian convert who is permitted to marry a Jewish woman, because levirate marriage is prohibited with an **aylonit**. The fact that the mishna omits these cases appears to indicate that the halakha is not in accordance with Rabbi Yoḥanan. The Gemara answers: There is no proof from here with regard to the halakha, as the tanna of the mishna did not mention all possible examples. Rather, he taught certain cases and omitted others. The Gemara asks: What else did he omit that he omitted this? The tanna would not have omitted only one example. The Gemara answers: He omitted the case of a **man with crushed testicles** or with other wounds to his genitals. If the husband is such a man, the wife is forbidden to her husband and permitted to her yavam. If the yavam is such a man, the opposite is true. The Gemara asks: If this mishna is determined to have taught certain cases and omitted others due to the omission of the case of a **man with crushed testicles** or other wounds to his genitals, this is not an omission, as in this mishna the tanna taught a principle that applies to all forbidden relationships for which one is liable for violating a prohibition.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.84b.5?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 84b:5-7)

(83) “He said to them: I am concerned about the minor boy, lest he be confirmed as a **sexually underdeveloped man** when he grows up, and I am concerned about the minor girl, lest she be confirmed as an **aylonit**, a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, when she grows up. Then levirate marriage would not apply, and they would end up encountering a forbidden relative if they consummated the levirate marriage. And the Rabbis hold: Follow the majority of minor boys, and most minor boys are not sexually underdeveloped when they grow up. Likewise, follow the majority of minor girls, and most minor girls are not in the category of **aylonit** when they grow up. This indicates that the Rabbis disagree with Rabbi Meir even with regard to a non-evident majority.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Yevamot.119a.8?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Yevamot 119a:8)

(84) “The Gemara asks: And is a woman not included in this prohibition? But isn’t it taught in a baraita (Tosefta, Nega’im 4:8): The beard of a woman and that of a **eunuch**, if they grow facial hair, are considered like a beard for all matters.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Kiddushin.35b.6?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Kiddushin 35b:6)

(85) “The Gemara returns to its question. But that which is taught in the baraita: The beard of a woman and that of a **eunuch**, if they grew facial hair, are considered like a beard for all matters, with regard to what halakha is this stated?”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Kiddushin.35b.13?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Kiddushin 35b:13)

(86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91) “And he is the **sexually underdeveloped man,** who is excluded from the mitzva of levirate marriage. Therefore, if his married brother dies childless, he neither performs ḥalitza nor enters into levirate marriage with his widow. Since a twenty-year-old is considered an adult even if he has not developed signs of puberty, there is no reason to examine the body. The Gemara replies: Wasn’t it stated with regard to that mishna: Rabbi Shmuel bar Rav Yitzḥak says that Rav says: And is this the halakha only where he developed the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man?** Otherwise, a twenty-year-old who has not developed two pubic hairs is still considered a minor. The examination of the deceased could therefore be effective to see if he has other signs of being sexually underdeveloped. Rava said: The language of the mishna is also precise, as it teaches: And he is the **sexually underdeveloped man.** The usage of the definitive article indicates that the mishna is referring to one who is clearly a **sexually underdeveloped man.** The Gemara affirms: One can conclude from the mishna that the mishna is speaking of one who developed the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man.** The Gemara asks: And if he did not develop the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man,** until when is he considered a minor if he does not develop two pubic hairs?”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bava_Batra.155b.1?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bava Batra 155b:1-3)

(92, 93) “Rabbi Meir said to them: In the case of a male minor I am concerned lest he is found to be a **eunuch**, i.e., one who is incapable of fathering children, when he grows up. Similarly, a female minor may not enter into levirate marriage lest when she grows up she is found to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman [ailonit],** who is incapable of bearing children. In either case the mitzva of levirate marriage does not apply, and they would be found to have encountered a forbidden relative and entered into a forbidden relationship where no mitzva applies, as the entire purpose of levirate marriage is to have children for the brother who died childless. And the Rabbis hold: Follow the majority of male minors, and most male minors are not **eunuchs**; and likewise, follow the majority of female minors, and most female minors are not **sexually underdeveloped women**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.19b.11?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 19b:11-12)

(94, 95, 96, 97, 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, 105, 106, 107, 108, 109, 110) “With regard to these two baraitot, the Sages assumed that everyone holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, who says: A **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, i.e., one who was entirely lacking in sexual capacity from birth, does not perform ḥalitza and does not enter into levirate marriage with his sister-in-law, as he is not included in the mitzva of levirate marriage. Likewise, if he died his brothers do not perform ḥalitza with his wife, and they may not enter into levirate marriage with her, as she is forbidden to them as a brother’s wife who does not require levirate marriage. Based on this assumption, the Gemara suggests: What, is it not that the two baraitot disagree about this, that the one who says that a **tumtum** performs ḥalitza and one of the brothers performs ḥalitza with the wife of the **tumtum** or enters into levirate marriage with the wife of the **tumtum** holds that we do not say that since this **tumtum** has changed from an average person, he might also have changed in that he is a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and therefore the brothers would be prohibited from entering into levirate marriage with the wife? Rather, if the **tumtum** is a male, it is assumed that he is capable of fathering children, and consequently his wife requires levirate marriage. And the one who says that the wife of a **tumtum** performs ḥalitza and does not enter into levirate marriage maintains that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, i.e., the possibility that he might be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** is considered, and therefore his wife may not enter into levirate marriage. The Gemara responds: No; everyone agrees that we say that since this person has changed, he has changed, and there is a concern that he might be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Rather, the difference between the rulings is that this baraita, which permits the wife of the **tumtum** to enter levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Eliezer, who disagrees with Rabbi Akiva and maintains that levirate marriage may be performed with the wife of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and that baraita, which prohibits levirate marriage, is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva, that the brothers of a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally** do not enter into levirate marriage with the wife of the **tumtum**. The Gemara asks: And who is the tanna who holds in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Akiva that the wife of a **eunuch** whose condition is caused naturally does not require levirate marriage, and yet he maintains that the wife of a **tumtum** must perform ḥalitza? If we say it is Rabbi Yehuda, this cannot be, as in his opinion even if the genitals of a **tumtum** were revealed and he was found to be a male, he deems him like a definite **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** and therefore his wife does not require ḥalitza at all. As we learned in a mishna (Yevamot 81a) that Rabbi Yehuda says: With regard to a **tumtum** who was torn open so that his genitals were exposed, and he was found to be a male, he must not perform ḥalitza, because he is treated like a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**. Just as this **tumtum** does not perform ḥalitza, so too, his widow does not require ḥalitza. Rather, it is the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that if a **tumtum** was torn open and he was found to be a male, he is considered as a matter of uncertainty to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally**, and consequently his wife requires ḥalitza. As it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, says: A **tumtum** does not perform ḥalitza with the wife of his late, childless brother if there are other brothers to perform ḥalitza, as perhaps the skin covering his genitals will be torn open and he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** and the widow would not be released from the levirate bond by his ḥalitza. According to this opinion, it is not certain that a **tumtum** would be found to be a eunuch whose condition is caused naturally. With regard to the opinion of Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, the Gemara asks: Why does this

individual not perform ḥalitza due only to the possibility that he will be found to be a eunuch whose condition is caused naturally? Is that to say that every **tumtum** whose skin was torn is found to be a male and is not found to be a female? The Gemara explains that Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, said his opinion in the formulation of: Perhaps, which includes multiple uncertainties: A **tumtum** must not perform ḥalitza, as perhaps he will be torn open and found to be a female, who can certainly not perform ḥalitza. Alternatively, if he is found to be a male, he may also not perform ḥalitza, since perhaps he will be found to be a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally.** The Gemara asks: Since both Rabbi Yehuda and Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, agree that a **tumtum** may not perform ḥalitza for his brother's wife, what is the practical difference between their opinions? Rava said: There is a practical difference with regard to disqualifying the widow, through his ḥalitza, from entering into levirate marriage in a case where there are other brothers. According to Rabbi Yehuda, who maintains that this individual is certainly a **eunuch whose condition is caused naturally,** his ḥalitza is of no effect whatsoever, and therefore she may enter into levirate marriage with one of the other brothers. Conversely, according to Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, since it is possible that he is not a **eunuch** and his ḥalitza is valid, she is forbidden to the other brothers as their brother's wife. And there is also a practical difference between their opinions with regard to performing ḥalitza with the widow in a case where there are no brothers other than this **tumtum**. According to Rabbi Yehuda, ḥalitza is not necessary in this case, as she requires ḥalitza only if her late husband had brothers who are obligated to perform levirate marriage, and this individual is definitely a **eunuch** whose condition is caused naturally. By contrast, Rabbi Yosei, son of Rabbi Yehuda, maintains that he must perform ḥalitza with her, in case he is a male and not a **eunuch**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bekhorot.42b.10?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Bekhorot 42b:10-43a:2)

(111, 112, 113, 114) "Rabbi Meir said to them: A minor boy may not enter into levirate marriage lest, once he is older, he be found to be a **sexually underdeveloped man**, who is incapable of fathering children. Likewise, a minor girl may not enter into levirate marriage lest, once she is older, she be found to be a **sexually underdeveloped woman**. And if a **sexually underdeveloped boy or girl** enters into levirate marriage they will be found to be infringing upon prohibitions against forbidden sexual intercourse where no mitzva applies, as the entire purpose of levirate marriage is to bear children in the name of the deceased. The Gemara notes: And the Rabbis maintain that one follows the majority of minor boys, and most minor boys are not going to be **sexually underdeveloped men**; likewise, one follows the majority of minor girls, and most minor girls are not going to be **sexually underdeveloped women**. In any event, the baraita indicates that Rabbi Meir is concerned for the minority. The Gemara objects: You can say that you heard that Rabbi Meir is concerned for a common minority, e.g., the minority of **sexually underdeveloped men and sexually underdeveloped women.**"

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.32a.3?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 32a:3-5)

(115, 116, 117, 118, 119, 120, 121, 122, 123) “MISHNA: A girl twelve years and one day old who grew two pubic hairs is classified as a young woman. Six months later, she becomes a grown woman. But a woman who is twenty years old who did not grow two pubic hairs and was never classified as a young woman shall bring proof that she is twenty years old, and from that point forward she assumes the status of a sexually **underdeveloped woman [ailonit],** who is incapable of bearing children. If she married and her husband died childless, she neither performs ḥalitza nor does she enter into levirate marriage, as the mitzva of levirate marriage applies only to a woman capable of conceiving a child. An **ailonit** is excluded from that mitzva. In the case of a man who is twenty years old who did not grow two pubic hairs, they shall bring proof that he is twenty years old and he assumes the status of a **sexually underdeveloped man [saris],** who is excluded from the mitzva of levirate marriage. Therefore, if his married brother dies childless, he neither performs ḥalitza nor enters into levirate marriage with his yevama. This is the statement of Beit Hillel. Beit Shammai say: For both this case of a woman and that case of a man, they shall bring proof that they are eighteen years old, and they assume the status of a **sexually underdeveloped woman and man** respectively. Rabbi Eliezer says: The status of the male is determined in accordance with the statement of Beit Hillel, i.e., he assumes the status of a **sexually underdeveloped man** at the age of twenty; and the status of the female is determined in accordance with the statement of Beit Shammai, i.e., she assumes the status of a **sexually underdeveloped woman** at the age of eighteen. The reason is that the woman is quick to reach physical maturity, and reaches that stage before the man reaches physical maturity. GEMARA: The mishna teaches that a **sexually underdeveloped man** does not enter into levirate marriage with the widow of his childless brother. And the Gemara raises a contradiction from another mishna (Yevamot 96b): A boy who is nine years and one day old, who has not developed two hairs, and a man who is twenty years old who has not grown two hairs, are one and the same to me with regard to levirate marriage, in that if they engaged in intercourse with the widow of their childless brother, this levirate marriage is partially effective, to the extent that this woman requires both a bill of divorce and ḥalitza. Rav Shmuel bar Yitzḥak says that Rav says in explanation of the ruling of the mishna here: And this halakha applies only in a case where he developed physical signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man** (see Yevamot 80b) by the age of twenty. By contrast, the mishna in Yevamot is referring to one who did not develop signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man**. Rava said: The language of the mishna is also precise, as it teaches: And he is a **sexually underdeveloped man,** which indicates that he had already developed physical signs of such a condition. The Gemara concludes: Conclude from it that this is the correct interpretation of the mishna. The Gemara asks a question with regard to the halakha itself: And in a case where he does not develop the signs of a **sexually underdeveloped man**, until what age is he considered a minor? Rabbi Ḥiyya teaches: Until most of his years have passed, i.e., until he reaches the age of thirty-five, halfway to seventy, which is the standard length of a person’s life. The Gemara relates: When people would come before Rabbi Ḥiyya to inquire about someone who had reached the age of puberty but had not yet developed the physical signs of maturity, if the person in question was thin, he would say to them: Go and fatten him up before we decide on his status. If he was fat, Rabbi Ḥiyya would say to them: Go and make him thin. As these signs indicating puberty sometimes come due to thinness and sometimes they come due to fatness. It is therefore possible that after his bodily shape is properly adjusted this individual will develop the signs indicating puberty and will not have the status of a **sexually underdeveloped man**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.47b.9?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 47b:9-15)

(124, 125, 126) “And furthermore, it is taught in a baraita that Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar says in the name of Rabbi Eliezer with regard to the halakhot of a **sexually underdeveloped man and a sexually underdeveloped woman:** The twentieth year, of which thirty days have passed, i.e., from the age of nineteen and thirty days, is considered like the twentieth year in all regards; and Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi similarly issued a practical ruling of halakha in the city of Lod, that the eighteenth year of which thirty days have passed is considered like the eighteenth year in all regards. Granted, according to the opinion of Ulla, it is not difficult that Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is referring to the eighteenth year whereas Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar discusses the twentieth year, as this statement of Rabbi Yehuda HaNasi is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Shammai with regard to the age of a **sexually underdeveloped woman**, and that statement of Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar is in accordance with the opinion of Beit Hillel. But according to the opinion of Rav, who maintains that full years are required for a **sexually underdeveloped man or woman**, this baraita poses a difficulty. The Gemara answers that this matter is a dispute between tanna’im, and Rav maintains in accordance with the opinion that full years are required. As it is taught in a baraita: Full years are required with regard to the period of one year stated with regard to sacrificial animals, e.g., “a lamb in its first year” (Leviticus 12:6); the one year stated with regard to houses of walled cities, during which one can redeem a house he has sold in a walled city (see Leviticus 25:29); and the two years stated with regard to an ancestral field, during which one cannot yet redeem an ancestral field he has sold (see Leviticus 25:15). The six years stated with regard to a Hebrew slave (see Exodus 21:2) and similarly the years of a son and of a daughter, as will be explained, all of these are years from the time of the first year until that same time of year in the year specified, i.e., these periods are units of whole years instead of expiring on predetermined dates, as at the end of the calendar year. This supports the opinion of Rav that the years mentioned with regard to a **sexually underdeveloped man or woman** are full years.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.47b.18?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 47b:18-21)

(127) “Rav Yitzḥak bar Naḥmani says that Rabbi Elazar says: The halakha is in accordance with the opinion of Rabbi Yosei ben Keifar, who said his ruling in the name of Rabbi Eliezer, that a man nineteen years and thirty days of age who has not developed signs of puberty is deemed a **sexually underdeveloped man**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Niddah.48a.8?lang=bi&sbsq=sexually%20underdeveloped%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Niddah 48a:8)

(128) “The Gemara answers: If you wish, say that the permission to wash one’s face with sand and natron refers to a child; and if you wish, say instead that it refers to a woman; and if you wish, say instead that it refers to a **eunuch**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.50b.4?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 50b:4)

(129, 130, 131, 132, 133) “Having quoted some aphorisms of the Sages, the Gemara relates the following conversation: A certain **eunuch** who was an apostate said the following to Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa as a provocation: How far is it from here to Karḥina? The provocateur’s intention was to hint to the fact that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa was bald [kere’aḥ]. He said to him: It is the same as the distance from here to the mountains of Gozen, hinting at the **eunuch’s** castration, which in Aramaic is goza (Rav Ya’akov Emden). The apostate said to him: A bald buck is sold for four dinar. He said to him: A castrated goat [ikkara shelifa] is sold for eight. The apostate saw that Rabbi Yehoshua ben Korḥa was not wearing shoes. He said to him: One who rides on a horse is a king. One who rides on a donkey is a free man. And one who wears shoes is at least a human being. One who does neither this nor that, someone who is buried in the earth is better than him. He said to him: **Eunuch, eunuch**, you said to me three things, and now hear three things: The glory of a face is the beard, the joy of the heart is a wife, and “the portion of the Lord is children” (Psalms 127:3); blessed is the Omnipresent who has denied you all of them, for a **eunuch** does not have a beard, a wife or children.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shabbat.152a.5?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Shabbat 152a:5-6)

(134) “A **sexually underdeveloped woman** who is incapable of bearing children **[ailonit],** and an elderly woman, and a woman who is incapable of giving birth for other reasons, neither collect payment of their marriage contracts nor drink the bitter water, as marrying a woman who cannot give birth constitutes a violation of the mitzva to be fruitful and multiply. Rabbi Elazar says: He can marry another woman and procreate through her; therefore, these are considered permitted marriages, and women in these categories can drink the bitter water. And all other women either drink the bitter water or do not collect payment of their marriage contracts. The wife of a priest drinks, and if she is found to be innocent of adultery, she is permitted to her husband. The wife of a **eunuch** also drinks.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.24a.6?lang=bi&sbsq=ailonit%20&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 24a:6-7)

(135, 136) “The mishna states: The wife of a **eunuch** drinks. The Gemara asks: Isn’t that obvious? Since their marriage is permitted, why should the sota ritual not apply? The Gemara replies: It is necessary lest you say that she does not drink, since the Merciful One states with regard to the sota: “But if you have gone astray while under your husband, and if you are defiled, and some man has lain with you besides your husband” (Numbers 5:20). This indicates that her husband had lain with her, and this husband, the **eunuch**, is not capable of that.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.26a.15?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 26a:15)

(137) “The Gemara asks: What is this fruit that he was not given an opportunity to produce? If we say it refers to being fruitful and multiplying, i.e., that the killer prevented him from having more children, but if that is so, in the case of an elderly person or a **eunuch**, so too will you say that we do not break the heifer’s neck because they could not have had any more children even had they lived?”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Sotah.46a.22?lang=bi&sbsq=eunuch&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Sotah 46a:22)

(138, 139) “All persons become unclean through zivah, even converts, even slaves whether freed or not, a deaf-mute, a person of unsound senses, and a minor, a **eunuch** whether [he had been castrated] by man, or was a **eunuch** from [the time of seeing] the sun. With regard to a **tumtum** and an **androgynous** [person], they place upon him the stringencies for a man and the stringencies for a woman: they defile through blood like a woman, and through eggy [substance] like a man.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Mishnah_Zavim.2.1?lang=en&sbsq=androgynous&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Mishnah, Zavim 2:1)

139 mentions total

Tikkun Olam

Tikkun Olam (Repairing the World) is the main agenda behind the Transgender movement.

Tikkun Olam is a concept from Kabbalah based on the regathering of the fractured shards and souls that were originally male and female, but were divided due to Adam's sin. The goal is then to fix this and return to the state before Adam's sin when he was originally Androgynous, below you will find a collection of quotes proving this notion.

"According to the Lurianic account, **the first man, Adam, was intended to restore the divine sparks through mystical exercises, but his sin interfered.** As a result, good and evil remained thoroughly mixed in the created world, and **human souls (previously contained within Adam's) also became imprisoned within the shards**. The 'repair,' that is needed, therefore, is two-fold: **the gathering of light and of souls**, to be achieved by human beings through the contemplative performance of religious acts. The goal of such repair, which can only be effected by humans, is to separate what is holy from the created world, thus depriving the physical world of its very existence —and causing all things **return to a world before disaster within the Godhead and before human sin, thus ending history**."

(https://www.myjewishlearning.com/article/tikkun-olam-repairing-the-world/#:~:text=According%20to%20the,within%20the%20shards)

(https://archive.ph/3AvYL#selection-1283.0-1311.7:~:text=According%20to%20the,thus%20ending%20history)

"Observe that **all spirits are compounded of male and female**, and when they go forth into the world they go forth as both male and female, and afterwards the two elements are separated. If a man is worthy they are afterwards united, and it is then that he truly meets his mate and there is a perfect union both in spirit and flesh. Hence it is written here: **'When a woman conceives seed and bears a male', and not 'male and female together', since on account of the ways of the world they are not united (at birth) as they were when they issued from on high, because the first man and his mate sinned before God**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.5.22?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 5:22)

"Listen to this. All the souls in the world, which are the fruit of the handiwork of the Almighty, are all mystically one, but when they descend to this world they are separated into male and female, though these are still conjoined."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Lech_Lecha.21.204?lang=en: Zohar, Lech Lecha 21:204)

"'Male and female he created them.' From this we learn that **every figure which does not comprise male and female elements is not a true and proper figure**, and so we have laid down in the esoteric teaching of our Mishnah. Observe this. **God does not place His abode in any place where male and female are not found together**, nor are blessings found save in such a place, as it is written, AND HE BLESSED THEM AND CALLED THEIR NAME MAN ON THE DAY THAT THEY WERE CREATED: note that it says them and their name, and not him and his name. **The male is not even called man till he is united with the female**."

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.95.368?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 95:368-369)

Eitan Fishbane (Professor of Jewish Thought): "Kabbalah includes both masculine and feminine within God"

(https://youtu.be/FIMx9zwIQtY?si=85jBi9_IeS0AFIR4&t=916)

Rabbi Abraham Shira: "A male soul in the physical can become female in this world then long to be back with its root soul and vice versa a female soul can come back and want to be a male soul because its root is coming from that place. On top of it there's an even higher level where a soul can just want to be one, and without gender, above gender, it sounds so spiritually removed so purified so rarified that you're not a man or a woman you're both and that's what androgyny is. And so this form, is at the earliest stages of creation what we are."

(https://youtu.be/HMlTT3HZyA8?si=dU13j6A1_UCDBRRw&t=414)

Sefer Razin D'Oraita, Rabbi Yechiel Michael from Zloczow (1731-1786): "It is known that when Issac was born, he was born with the soul of a female, as it is written in Or Hachaim, and through the akeidah (binding of Issac) he got a male soul that can influence (meaning, can impregnate). ... But, this is known according to the Sod (Secret/Mysticism) of reincarnation—that at times, a female would be in a male body, because in the reasons of gilgal (reincarnation) the soul of a female would come to be in a male."

(https://www.sefaria.org/sheets/425178.93?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en)

(https://archive.ph/WMSFI#selection-983.0-1029.11:~:text=Sefer%20Razin%20D%27Oraita%2C%20Rabbi%20Yechiel%20Michael%20from%20Zloczow%20(1731%2D1786)

“Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: **When the Holy One blessed be He created Adam the first man, He created him androgynous.** That is what is written: **“He created them male and female”** (Genesis 5:2). Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥman said: When the Holy One blessed be He created Adam the first man, **He created him with two faces**, and [subsequently] He sawed him in two and made [for] him two backs, a back here and a back there. They raised an objection to him: But is it not written: “He took one of his ribs [tzalotav] … [and the Lord God built the rib that He took from the man into a woman]”? (Genesis 2:21–22). He said to them: [It means that He took] **one of his two sides**, as it says: “And for the tzela of the Tabernacle” (Exodus 26:20), which we translate: “And for the side of the Tabernacle...”.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Bereshit_Rabbah.8.1?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Bereshit Rabbah 8:1)

“Rabbi Shmuel bar Naḥman said: When the Holy One blessed be He created **Adam the first man, He created him androgynous**. Reish Lakish said: When he was created, he was created with two faces. [God] sawed him, and two backs were formed, a back for the male and a back for the female. They raised an objection to him: “He took one of his ribs [mitzalotav]…[the Lord God built the rib that He took from the man into a woman]” (Genesis 2:21). He said to them: It was one of his sides, as it is written: “For the [second] side [ultzela] of the Tabernacle” (Exodus 26:20).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Vayikra_Rabbah.14.1?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Vayikra Rabbah 14:1)

“I have written on a number of occasions that man is the purpose of Creation, that he was created in the image and likeness of G–d, and that just as **Adam originally had two faces to indicate the equality of man and woman**, so also man's body and soul respectively used to be perfect and both were sanctified to their G–d. **Woman subsequently was separated from Adam** in order to become his helpmate (partner), to enable them to unite truly and to become "one flesh" (Genesis 2:24).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Shenei_Luchot_HaBerit%2C_Torah_Shebikhtav%2C_Ki_Teitzei%2C_Torah_Ohr.1?lang=en: Shenei Luchot HaBerit, Torah Shebikhtav, Ki Teitzei, Torah Ohr 1)

“מצלעותיו OF HIS RIBS — The word means of his sides, similar to (Exodus 26:20) ולצלע המשכן “and for the second side of the tabernacle”; this has a bearing upon what they (the Sages) say, **(Eruvin 18a): They were created with two faces (sides).**”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Rashi_on_Genesis.2.21.1?lang=en&with=all&lang2=en: Rashi on Genesis 2:21:1)

“And this is the mystery of the creation of the first man, who was created with two faces (male and female combined).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Introduction.6.26?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Introduction 6:26)

“The colleagues here interrupted and said, ‘Rabbi, Rabbi, is there such a division between Father and Mother that from the side of the Father Man has been formed in the way of emanation, and from the side of the Mother in the way of creation?’ He replied, ‘My friends, it is not so, since the **Man of emanation was both male and female**, from the side of both Father and Mother, and that is why it says, ‘And God said, Let there be light, and there was light’: ‘let there be light’ from the side of the Father, ‘and there was light’ from the side of the Mother; and this is the man ‘of two faces’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.14.165?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 14:165)

“FRUIT TREE BEARING FRUIT. One degree above another, these combining male and female. (…) The words ‘fruit tree bearing fruit’ indicate the form of male and female in combination. Their faces are ‘like the face of a man’ (Ezek. 1, 10), but they are not like the Cherubim, having large faces covered with beards, whereas the Cherubim have little faces like those of tender children. All forms are comprised in these, because they are ‘large faces’. On them are traced forms like the tracings of the Divine Name on the four cardinal points, East, West, North, and South. Michael is imprinted on the South, and all faces are turned towards him, viz. ‘the face of a man… the face of a lion… the face of an ox… the face of an eagle’ (Ibid.). “**Man” implies the union of male and female, without which the name ‘man’ (Adam) is not applied**. By him are formed the figures of the chariot of God, as it is written: ‘(On) the chariot of God are myriads of thousands of Shin’an (angels)’ (Ps. 68, 15): the word SHiN’AN expresses by means of its initials all the figures, the Shin standing for Shor (ox), the Nun for Nesher (eagle), and the Aleph for Aryeh (lion), and the final Nun representing by its shape man, who walks erect, and who mystically combines male and female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.8.80?lang=bi&with=all&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 8:80-83)

“When these three letters descended below, together in their complete form, the name **Adam was found to comprise male and female**. The female was attached to the side of the male until God cast him into a deep slumber, during which he lay on the site of the Temple. God then sawed her off from him and adorned her like a bride and brought her to him, as it is written, ‘And he took one of his sides and closed up the place with flesh.’ (Gen. 2, 21).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.41.414?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 41:414-416)

“‘Let us make man’: the word **adam (man) implies male and female**, created wholly through the supernal and holy Wisdom. ‘In our image, after our likeness’: **the two being combined**, so that man should be unique in the world and ruler over all.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.73.172?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 73:172)

“This is to indicate that when the world was finished the male and female were united so as to form a single whole-he’ with ‘sixth’, which is the foundation.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.74.175?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 74:175)

“THE MAN: as we have explained, male and female, together and not separated, so as to turn face to face.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bereshit.81.209?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bereshit 81:209)

“R. Isaac said: ‘Adam was created as a double personality (male and female), as previously explained.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Beshalach.16.233?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Beshalach 16:233)

“Said R. Abba: The first man consisted of male and female, for it says: ‘Let us make man in our image after our likeness’ (Ibid. 1, 26), which indicates that male and female were originally created as one and separated afterwards.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Beshalach.16.238?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Beshalach 16:238)

“There are two grades, male and female. For all the souls and spirits that enter human beings are alluded to in the words ‘generations of man (Adam)’, for they all issue from the ‘Righteous One’, and this is the ‘watering of the river that went out of Eden to water the garden’ (Gen. 2, 10). There is also another, a lower ‘Adam’, alluded to in the words, ‘on the day that God created man (Adam)’, in the same verse. In regard to the upper **Adam, the union of male and female** is at first only distantly alluded to in the words ‘this is the book’, but after they produced offspring they are called openly ‘Adam’. Then it is said that God made man in the ‘likeness’ of God. By the word ‘likeness’ we are to understand a kind of mirror in which images appear momentarily and then pass away. According to another explanation, the word ‘likeness’ refers to **the union of male and female organs**: and so the Master affirmed. In regard to the upper **Adam, the union of male and female** is at first only distantly alluded to in the words ‘this is the book’, but after they produced offspring they are called openly ‘Adam’. Then it is said that God made man in the ‘likeness’ of God. By the word ‘likeness’ we are to understand a kind of mirror in which images appear momentarily and then pass away. According to another explanation, the word ‘likeness’ refers to **the union of male and female organs**: and so the Master affirmed.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Yitro.4.63?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Yitro 4:63-67)

“Man was in the Divine mind, in the inner mystery. God created him, male and female in one, ‘in the image of God’, symbolized by the palm.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Yitro.11.170?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Yitro 11:170)

“Observe that at the creation of Adam the Holy One, blessed be He, made him male and female together, female behind and male before.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Pekudei.21.202?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Pekudei 21:202)

“And therefore ‘God formed man dust from the ground’, etc. (Gen. 2, 7), that he might join one with the other and himself be perfect. And therefore **God created man male and female** that he might be perfect.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.13.94?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 13:94)

“For when God created man, He created him without flaw, as it is written, ‘God made man upright’ (yashar, lit. straight) (Eccles. 7, 20). The word **‘man’ (adam) means male and female, the female being included in the male**, and hence it says ‘upright’.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Vayikra.44.315?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Vayikra 44:315)

“The word ‘man’ (adam) indicates a combination of male and female.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Tazria.18.80?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Tazria 18:80)

“For since Scripture says ‘And God created man in his own image’, why repeat ‘in the image of God created he him’? But what it signifies is a two-foldness of grades, of **male and female comprised within the man**, which made him a duality of prosopa, so that he was complete in all respects, and he contemplated in wisdom both what was above and what was below.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Bamidbar.1.2?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Bamidbar 1:2)

“Said R. Judah: ‘But there is a teaching that the term **‘Adam’ signifies the conjunction of male and female**?’ R. Eleazar in reply said: ‘Assuredly so. He who achieves for himself **the union of male and female is called Adam**, and in this way has the fear of sin. He attains, moreover, to the virtue of humility, and even the degree of grace. Contrariwise, he who remains without that union possesses neither fear nor humility nor the state of grace. So Scripture says: ‘For I have said: The world is built by Grace’ (Ibid. 89, 3), to wit, by **Adam, who denotes the union of male and female**.”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Zohar%2C_Nasso.13.141?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Zohar, Nasso 13:141)

“Alternatively, this duplication in the language of creation can be explained in accordance with the statement of Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar, as Rabbi Yirmeya ben Elazar said: The Holy One, Blessed be He, created two faces [*du partzufin*] on **Adam the first man; he was created both male and female in a single body**, as it is stated: ‘You have formed me [*tzartani*] behind and before’ (Psalms 139:5); *tzartani* is derived from the word *tzura* [face]. God formed two faces on a single creation, back and front. It is stated: ‘And the *tzela* which the Lord, God, had taken from the man, He made a woman, and brought her unto the man’ (Genesis 2:22).”

(https://www.sefaria.org/Berakhot.61a.5?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Berakhot 61a:5)

“The Gemara suggests: Let us say that they disagree about this: One Sage holds: It was one act of creation with which man was created. And one Sage holds: It was two acts of creation with which man was created. The first opinion, that there was one act of creation, is based on the concept that **man was created with two sides, one male and one female**. There was no additional act of creation. Man and woman were subsequently separated into two independent beings. Therefore, there is no need for the two blessings: Who created mankind, and: Who created mankind in His image. The second opinion is that there were in fact two separate acts of creation. Therefore, it is appropriate to recite two blessings with regard to the creation of mankind. The Gemara rejects that suggestion: No, everyone agrees that it was only one act of creation. However, one Sage holds: It is according to the initial thought that we proceed. And one Sage holds: It is according to the action that we proceed. **God’s initial thought was to create man and woman as separate entities. Ultimately, they were created as one entity**. That explanation is like the following. Rav Yehuda raises a contradiction. In one verse it is written: ‘And God created man in His own image’ (Genesis 1:27), indicating one act of creation, and in another verse it is written: ‘Male and female He created them’ (Genesis 5:2), indicating two acts. How can this apparent contradiction be resolved? Initially, the thought entered God’s mind to create two, but **ultimately only one was actually created**.

(https://www.sefaria.org/Ketubot.8a.8?lang=en&sbsq=male%20and%20female&with=SidebarSearch&lang2=en: Talmud, Ketubot 8a:8-9)

Miscellaneous Quotes

“Hirschfeld’s most significant achievement was founding the world-famous Institut für Sexualwissenschaft in 1919. Located in a Berlin-Tiergarten villa, it served as a public training and information centre, patient treatment facility, centre of expertise, and simultaneously as a scientific research facility. A number of scholars and physicians lived and worked here, **the majority of them Jewish**.”

(https://www.academia.edu/37497997/UROLOGY_under_the_SWASTIKA: UROLOGY under the SWASTIKA page 53)

“Many of the (Institute for Sexual Science) institute’s employees were, like Hirschfeld himself, Jewish.”

(https://artblart.com/tag/scientific-humanitarian-committee/#:~:text=Many%20of%20the%20institute%E2%80%99s%20employees%20were%2C%20like%20Hirschfeld%20himself%2C%20Jewish)

(https://archive.ph/rfvU8#selection-4255.485-4255.556:~:text=Many%20of%20the%20institute%E2%80%99s%20employees%20were%2C%20like%20Hirschfeld%20himself%2C%20Jewish)

“Much early sexological research, indeed the very concept of sexology, was the work of German Jews.”

(https://www.jstor.org/stable/3812563#:~:text=Much%20early%20sexological%20research%2C%20indeed%20the%20very%20concept%20of%20sexology%2C%20was%20the%20work%20of%20German%20Jews)

(https://archive.ph/5M3pf#selection-1181.0-1181.97:~:text=Much%20early%20sexological%20research%2C%20indeed%20the%20very%20concept%20of%20sexology%2C%20was%20the%20work%20of%20German%20Jews)

“Homosexuality Is Part of Jewish Tradition”

“Intimate relations between men existed in Jewish communities and apparently were also common”

(https://www.haaretz.com/jewish/2015-08-05/ty-article/.premium/homosexuality-part-of-jewish-tradition/0000017f-f64d-d5bd-a17f-f67f92080000)

(https://archive.ph/lZrBu)

“Why I, as an Orthodox Rabbi, Support Legalizing Same-sex Marriage; The separation of church and state is what enables me to practice my religion freely – and we have a responsibility to welcome gays into our community”

(https://www.haaretz.com/opinion/2015-07-15/ty-article/why-i-as-an-orthodox-rabbi-support-legalizing-same-sex-marriage/0000017f-db46-d3ff-a7ff-fbe6ebc90000)

(https://archive.ph/39x64)

“Trans Rights is a Jewish Issue; Why Antisemitism is a Trans Issue”

(https://jewishpublicaffairs.org/press-release/jcpa2018-annual-conference-calls-for-strengthened-jewish-community-engagement-to-build-a-strong-democratic-america-and-israel/#:~:text=%E2%80%9CTrans%20Rights%20is%20a%20Jewish%20Issue%3B%20Why%20Antisemitism%20is%20a%20Trans%20Issue%E2%80%9D)

(https://archive.ph/jFX2G#selection-571.0-571.67:~:text=%E2%80%9CTrans%20Rights%20is%20a%20Jewish%20Issue%3B%20Why%20Antisemitism%20is%20a%20Trans%20Issue%E2%80%9D)

“Why LGBTQ pride is a Jewish issue”

(https://religionnews.com/2022/06/20/lgbtq-pride-jews/)

(https://archive.ph/xJNXE#selection-665.21-665.54:~:text=Why%20LGBTQ%20pride%20is%20a%20Jewish%20issue)

“’Sexuality research was highly political?’ Absolutely, from the get-go. Even, by the way, in Germany. **The beginnings of the research were done here by German-Jewish dermatologists**”

(https://www.dw.com/en/kinsey-report-at-70-a-sober-researcher-on-a-still-hot-topic/a-42386751#:~:text=Sexuality%20research%20was,German%2DJewish%20dermatologists)

(https://archive.ph/fQtdg#selection-945.0-949.136:~:text=Sexuality%20research%20was,German%2DJewish%20dermatologists)

“Amongst the growing number of German-speaking sexologists active during the Wilhelminian era and the Weimar Republic, Magnus Hirschfeld (1868–1935), Albert Moll (1862–1939) and Iwan Bloch (1872–1922) — **all of Jewish origins** and based in Berlin — **were the most prominent and internationally most influential**, each putting his distinctive mark on the field.”

(https://annas-archive.org/slow_download/f0b1b1c67327bb54c4ac88a521d00887/0/0: modernism and perversion: Sexual Deviance in Sexology and Literature, 1850-1930 page 112-113)

(https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1057/9780230358904_5#:~:text=Amongst%20the%20growing,on%20the%20field)

(https://archive.ph/dk0Hh#selection-547.226-547.580:~:text=Amongst%20the%20growing,on%20the%20field)

92% of Reform Jews and 89% of Jews with no denomination support LGBT, while only 57% of Christians and 87% of religiously unaffiliated people do.

(https://ejewishphilanthropy.com/who-are-the-jewish-lgbt-households-and-how-involved-are-they-in-their-jewish-identity/#:~:text=However%2C%20some%20significant%20differences%20in,ultra%2DOrthodox%20(20%25)

(https://web.archive.org/web/20250618203618/https://ejewishphilanthropy.com/who-are-the-jewish-lgbt-households-and-how-involved-are-they-in-their-jewish-identity/#:~:text=92%25%20of%20Reform%20Jews%2C%20and%2089%25%20of%20Jews%20with%20no%20denomination)

(https://ajr.edu/wp-content/uploads/Gvanim-10-2019-Sheskin-Hartman.pdf: A Profile of LGBT Jewish Households page 74)

(https://www.pewresearch.org/religion/2025/02/26/religion-and-views-on-lgbtq-issues-and-abortion/)

(https://archive.ph/sNl9o)

Survey: Jews are the most accepting group toward trans people

(https://forward.com/fast-forward/549802/trans-gender-fluidity-jews-accepting-group-america/)

(https://archive.ph/FxVxB)

The Jewish Autonomous Oblast’s Flag is a rainbow, very similar to the LGBTQ Flag

(https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Flag_of_the_Jewish_Autonomous_Oblast)

(https://archive.ph/CGIDW)

The Sage Encyclopedia of Trans Studies (Chapter: Ancient/Medieval Times, Jews and Judaism)

(https://1lib.sk/book/28466188/b0515f/the-sage-encyclopedia-of-trans-studies.html)

“Jewish women were present in large numbers during the early years of the lesbian feminist movement.”

(https://archive.org/details/encyclopediaofle0001unse_c3g4/mode/2up?: Encyclopedia of Lesbian, Gay, Bisexual, and Transgender History in America page 72)

The Secret Doctrine in Israel by Arthur Waite (Freemason and Mystic Scholar)

(https://archive.org/details/secretdoctrinein00wait/mode/2up)

Conclusion

In conclusion it is clear that Jews had a huge part in the LGBTQ movement. More specifically within the Trangender branch, where the scriptures became the theoretical basis, Jewish intellectuals it’s conditioning and then came the Jewish activists and lobbyists for the application of it. In my personal opinion as I finish this investigation for now, I think in the topic of Homosexuality it is a bit more mixed and nuanced, because it is true that Gentiles contributed extensively to it while collaborating with the Jews for it, it seems to have been of a mutual interest where the victims of mental illness and degeneracy got what they wanted, to just keep being so, and the Jews got the advancements of their agenda.